VOL. XLI NO. 3

The Catholic Historical Review

MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE ROBERT F. TRISCO
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

HENRY G. J. BECK
Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington

BASIL LEO LEE, F.S.C.
Manhattan College

FREDERICK B. PIKE
University of Notre Dame

DAVID J. HERLIHY
Bryn Mawr College

EDWARD D. McSHANE, S.J.
Alma College

VINCENT G. TEGEDER, O.S.B.
St. John's University Collegeville

Table of Contents

OCTOBER, 1959

ARTICLES

The Selection of Bishops Suffragan to Hincmar of Rheims, 845-882 . . . . *Henry G. J. Beck* 273

Liberalism and the Mexican Crisis of 1927: A Debate between Norman Thomas and John A. Ryan *Francis L. Broderick* 309

MISCELLANY

A Note on Cardinal Allen's Political Thought . . . . *Thomas O. Hanley* 327

BOOK REVIEWS 335

NOTES AND COMMENTS 348

BRIEF NOTICES 358

PERIODICAL LITERATURE 393

BOOKS RECEIVED 401

BOOK REVIEWS

The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople. Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire. (Paul J. Alexander.) Cyril Toumanoff 335

Warriors of God: The Great Religious Orders and Their Founders. (Walter Nigg. Edited and translated by Mary Ilford from the German.) William A. Hinnebusch 339

St. Odo of Cluny. Being the Life of St. Odo of Cluny by John of Salerno and the Life of St. Gerald of Aurillac by St. Odo. (Edited and translated by Gerard Sitwell, O.S.B.). Gerard J. Campbell 341

The Great Chartulary of Glastonbury. Volumes I, II, and III. (Edited by Dom Aelred Watkin). Owen J. Blum 342

Jacopo Sadoleto, 1477-1547. Humanist and Reformer. (Richard M. Douglas). William V. Bangert 343

Der Josephinismus. Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Oesterreich, 1760-1850; I. Band: *Ursprung und Wesen des Josephinismus, 1760-1769;* II. Band: *Entfaltung und Krise des Josephinismus, 1770-1790;* III. Band: *Das Werk des Hofrats Heinke, 1768-1790;* IV. Band: *Der Spätjosephinismus, 1790-1820.* (Ferdinand Maas, S.J.) Friedrich Engel-Janosi 344

The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XLV OCTOBER, 1959 No. 3

THE SELECTION OF BISHOPS SUFFRAGAN TO HINCMAR OF RHEIMS, 845-882

By

HENRY G. J. BECK*

The requirements current in his day for canonical election to suffragan bishoprics find expression in the correspondence and treatises of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims.[1] But since practice does not always follow theory, it is of interest to study what is still known of the archbishop's actions regarding the episcopal vacancies which occurred within his own ecclesiastical province during the thirty-seven years of his pontificate.

Hincmar held to the view that under his predecessor, St. Remigius (c. 460-c. 533), twelve cities, with bishops of their own, viz., Soissons, Châlons-sur-Marne, *civitas Veromandorum* (Saint-Quentin, Noyon), Arras, Cambrai, Tournai, Senlis, Beauvais, Amiens, Thérouanne (*Morinum*), Boulogne, and Laon, had been subject to the Archbishop of Rheims.[2] It may be questioned whether all twelve were episcopal sees as early as Remigius' day, or, if that be admitted, whether they were governed by twelve different prelates. At all events, at least by the middle or late sixth century the faithful of Arras were being governed by a bishop at Cambrai.[3] By the early decades of the seventh century, the Diocese of Tournai had been made subject to the Bishop of Noyon.[4] At the middle of the same century Boulogne was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Thérouanne, thus setting the number of Rheims suffragans at nine, the figure which obtained in Hincmar's own day.[5]

---

* Monsignor Beck is professor of church history in Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, New Jersey.

[1] Cf. Henry G. J. Beck, "Canonical Election to Suffragan Bishoprics according to Hincmar of Rheims," *Catholic Historical Review*, XLIII (July, 1957), 137-159.

[2] *De jure metropolitanorum*, xix (Migne, *Patrologia Latina* [*PL*], 126, 200B); that Hincmar thought of the twelve cities as having individual bishops is deduced from *Opusculum LV capitulorum*, i (*ibid.*, 294D-295A). For a study of these cities, excluding Boulogne, cf. Fernand Vercauteren, *Étude sur les civitates de la Belgique Seconde . . . de la fin du III^e à la fin du XI^e siècle* (Brussels, 1934). Works cited without the author's name are from the pen of Hincmar.

---

[3] J. Lestocquoy, *La vie religieuse d'une province, le diocèse d'Arras* (Arras, 1949), pp. 5-9, 284-286, considers Diogenes (late fourth century) as a bishop at Arras, though he speaks of St. Vaast (500-540) as the true founder of the diocese. Bishop Vedulph is credited with the transfer (545 or later) of the seat of the episcopate from Arras to Cambrai, so that Géry (584-590—624-627) is Bishop of Cambrai-Arras. J. Warichez, "Les fastes épiscopaux de Cambrai," in *Collationes dioecesis Tornacensis,* 21 (1925-26), 294, looks upon St. Vaast as the founder of the See of Cambrai as well as of Arras, though resident at Arras. To Vedulph (d. 580) "se rattache le transfert de la résidence épiscopale d'Arras à Cambrai." H. Lancelin, *Histoire du diocèse de Cambrai* (Valenciennes, 1946), pp. 27-28, holds the same view as to the origin of the Diocese of Cambrai.

[4] Abel LeFranc, *Histoire de la ville de Noyon et de ses institutions* (Paris, 1887), p. 5, maintains that about 531 Bishop Medard transferred his see among the Veromandui from Saint-Quentin to Noyon, a transfer which L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* (Paris, 1915), III, 99, places a score of years later. Vercauteren, *Étude sur les civitates de la Belgique Seconde,* p. 167, rejects this position in favor of the opinion that Noyon was established as a bishopric only shortly before 614. Joseph Warichez, *Les origines de l'église de Tournai* (Louvain-Paris, 1902), pp. 57, 62, 70, also his "Les fastes épiscopaux de Tournai," in *Collationes dioecesis Tornacensis,* 21 (1925-26), 196-200, holds that the Diocese of Tournai, founded by St. Eleutherius (after 496-531?), was united with Noyon while St. Acharius (c. 626-c. 638) was Bishop of Noyon. As late as 842 the Noyon prelate used the title "Vermandensis, Tornacensis, Noviomagensis ecclesie presul"; cf. Georges Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve* (Paris, 1943), I, 35.

[5] D. A. Stracke, "Over het prae-frankisch bisdom, in Noord-West-Gallië, te Bononia," in *Ons Geestelijk Erf* (Tielt), 28 (1954), 117-150, concludes in favor of an episcopal see at Boulogne prior to the sixth century. Pierre Héliot inclines towards placing the establishment of an ephemeral Boulogne bishopric at the beginning of the fifth century; see "Sur l'evêché de Boulogne," in *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France,* 34 (1948), 214-215, and "Sur la topographie antique et les origines chrétiennes de Boulogne-sur-Mer," in *Revue archéologique,* 1958, II, 48-61. On the other hand, H. van Werveke, *Het bisdom Terwaan van den oorsprong tot het begin der veertiende eeuw* (Gand-Paris, 1924), 11-13, finds no evidence for a Boulogne bishopric before the seventh century. Both van Werveke, 8, and Stracke, 140-141, adduce texts showing that St. Omer (c. 639-

Within these nine suffragan dioceses, twenty-one episcopal vacancies called for the archbishop's attention between 845-882. In the large number of instances, as will be seen, Hincmar insisted upon, and seems to have obtained, canonical election by the bishopric's clergy and people. But given the evidence of direct nomination to episcopal sees by King Charles the Bald (840-877) during the early years of his reign, the possibility cannot be excluded that on occasion Hincmar may have had to make do with other than canonically chosen prelates among his suffragans.[6]

First of the episcopal vacancies in the province to demand the action of the Archbishop of Rheims was that at Beauvais, where Bishop Hildemann had died prior to Hincmar's own consecration (May 3, 845), probably in December, 844.[7] There is indication still extant that the new archbishop wrote to both Charles the Bald and

---

c. 667) was bishop of Thérouanne as well as Boulogne. E. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'église en Belgique* (2nd ed., Brussels, 1945), I, 59, 63, 69, accepts the view of van Werveke, 16-23, that Omer was the first prelate of Thérouanne. Though willing to admit that Omer is the first Thérouanne bishop of whom we are really certain, O. Bled, *Regestes des évêques de Thérouanne* (Saint-Omer, 1904), I, pp. xxiv, xxxvi, 38-39, does not exclude the possibility that the Thérouanne diocese may have been founded by a Bishop Antimond about the year 500. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 133, also puts Antimond at the head of the Thérouanne episcopal list, but he dates him at the end of the sixth or the beginning of the next century. The names and the sees of Hincmar's nine suffragans in early 849 are given in *De praedestinatione,* ii (*PL* 125, 85AB).

[6] In 841, King Charles named Wenilo Bishop of Sens, in 842, Bernus and Godelsad, respectively, Bishops of Autun and Châlons-sur-Saône, apparently without any semblance of diocesan election; cf. G. Weise, *Koenigtum und Bischofswahl im fraenkischen und deutschen Reich* (Goettingen, 1912), pp. 37 ff., and P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les élections episcopales dans l'église de France du 9ᵉ au 12ᵉ siècle* (Paris, 1891), pp. 182 ff. Under disturbed conditions, Hincmar and the Council of Meaux in June, 845 (canon 8, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* [*MGH*], *Capitularia,* II, 399) had agreed that "sedes vacans episcopum a vobis (King Charles) regulariter designatum . . . accipiat" without demanding specifically local election. Even as late as February, 857, Hincmar and his colleagues at Kiersy had urged Charles to expel the usurping Wulfad by installing Isaac as Bishop of Langres, though Isaac does not seem to have been popularly elected; cf. Hincmar's *Epistles* 100-103 (*MGH, Epistolae,* VIII, 50), and Heinrich Schrörs, *Hinkmar, Erzbischof von Reims* (Freiburg, 1884), pp. 274-275.

[7] Hildemann appears for the last time at the synod of Germigny in 843 (J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* [Venice, 1769], XIV, 796A) which was certainly prior to October 14, 843 (cf. Tessier,

his queen, Ermentrude, strongly urging a canonical election for Beauvais and clearly stating that he would have nothing to do with the installation of a simoniacal prelate. These letters belong to the closing months of 845. By January, or early February, 846, Hincmar summoned his suffragan, Bishop Immo of Noyon, to attend the consecration of Ermenfrid to the See of Beauvais, an epistle which witnesses to the archbishop's acceptance of Ermenfrid and probably (though not certainly) to a prior canonical election by the clergy and people of Beauvais.[8]

Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve, I, 68). He was not present at the council held in April, 845, in his own cathedral (*MGH, Capit.,* II, 387). Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 121, rightly concludes that by this latter date he was already dead, a death which is assigned to December 8, 843, or 844. The editors of *Gallia christiana* (Paris, 1751), IX, 697, accept the December 8 obit but suggest 845 or 846. Abbé Delettre, *Histoire du diocèse de Beauvais* (Beauvais, 1842), I, 336, Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* 561, n. 4, and J. Corblet, *Hagiographie du diocèse d'Amiens* (Paris-Amiens, 1873), III, 7, agree in favoring December 8, 844, though Corblet is aware of variant obits for Hildemann in the necrologies, v.g., December 11, December 15, May 3, and May 21. L.-H. Labande, *Histoire de Beauvais et de ses institutions communales* (Paris, 1892), p. 20, believes that the evidence for Hildemann's death on December 11, 844, is better than that for December 8.

[8] This correspondence is preserved only in the digest form provided by Flodoard's *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* and is now edited by Ertl as Hincmar's *Epist.* 5, to Queen Ermentrude (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, pp. 2-3), *Epist.* 6, to King Charles (*ibid.,* p. 3): "pro electione Belvacensis episcopi post obitum Hildemanni presulis ipsius urbis. In qua epistola regem studet a simoniaca heresi compescere, asserens sibi multo amabilius esse istum episcopatum secundum seculum dimittere quam episcopum contra canonicam institutionem non tam benedicere quam aeterna secum maledictione maledicere"; *Epist.* 9, to Immo of Noyon (*ibid.*): "pro sinodo comprovinciali Parisius a rege condicta et pro ordinatione Irminfridi post decessum Hildemanni Belvacensis episcopi." Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* 561-2, n. 4, rightly notes that the synod referred to is the Paris assembly of February 14, 846 (*MGH, Capit.,* II, 397), so that Ermenfrid's consecration belongs to January-February, 846. Ermenfrid first appears in the signing of a *privilegium* for the abbey of Corbie dated "anno ab incarnatione Domini . . . DCCCXLVI, indictione X" (L. Levillain, *Examen critique des chartes mérovingiennes et carolingiennes de l'abbaye de Corbie* [Paris, 1902], pp. 257-265, signature, p. 263) which *privilegium* emanates from a Paris synod. Levillain originally dated this assembly as that of February 14-28, 847. He has subsequently (*Correspondance de Loup de Ferrières* [Paris, 1927], I, 243 n.) advanced the opening of this synod to late December 846. This same synod is assigned to December 846-January, 847, by F. Lot-L. Halphen, *Le règne de Charles le Chauve* (Paris, 1909), p. 180, and by E. Lesne, "Hincmar et l'empereur Lothaire," in *Revue des questions historiques,* 78 (1905), 16 n., though Lesne connects the

A second vacancy in the provincial hierarchy occurred with the death of Bishop Simeon of Laon sometime after the Paris synod which met in late December, 846. Unfortunately, we are without information as to the means whereby Pardulus was made his successor in the course of 847, but that the process was, at least, not noticeably irregular may be surmised from Hincmar's instructing Bishop Immo of Noyon to take part in Pardulus' consecration.[9]

Amiens lost its bishop, Ragenar, sometime after the synod of Kiersy which had assembled prior to Easter (April 14), 849. Possibly in June of the same year King Charles bestowed the vacant see upon one Hilmerad, but since Abbot Lupus of Ferrières wrote to the Archbishop of Rheims in an effort to show that Hilmerad could function usefully as a bishop, despite his deficient learning, it would appear that the royal nomination was not intended to disregard the metropolitan's right of approving his suffragans.[10] On Hincmar's part,

---

Corbie *privilegium* with the earlier Paris council of February 14, 846. However, the tenth indiction dates the *privilegium* as subsequent to September, 846. Delettre, *Histoire du diocèse de Beauvais,* I, 342-343, suggests that Ermenfrid's election at Beauvais was approved by the Paris synod which issued the Corbie *privilegium.*

[9] *Epist.* 17, to Immo of Noyon (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 7): "pro ordinatione Parduli post obitum Simeonis Laudunensis." Simeon is last recorded as signing the *privilegium* for Corbie (Levillain, *Examen critique,* p. 263) which the preceding note assigns to December, 846. Pardulus was still a deacon of Rheims in June, 845 (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 212, 218). If one accepts the chronology of Levillain, *Correspondance de Loup de Ferrières,* I, 243, 244, by April, 847, Pardulus was an "episcopus vocatus" with a date set for consecration. This consecration is placed by Lot-Halphen, *Règne de Charles le Chauve,* p. 157 n., "au début de 847, peut-être avant," which latter possibility is excluded by Simeon's signing of the Corbie document. When comparison is made between Lupus of Ferrières, *Epist* 71 (Levillain, *Correspondance,* II [1935], 8-10) and a diploma of Charles the Bald, dated December 5, 847 (Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* I, 270-74), grounds are had for thinking that Pardulus was a bishop prior to the date of the diploma. The basic authenticity of the December 5 document is defended by M. Prou in *Mélanges d'histoire du Moyen-Age offerts à M. Ferdinand Lot* (Paris, 1925), pp. 677-690. A chronology of the Laon prelates: Simeon, 832-848; Pardulus, 848-857, is given by Jules Saincir, *Le diocèse de Soissons* (Évreux, 1936), II, 558-559, without discussion or documentation.

[10] Lupus of Ferrières, *Epist.* 74 (Levillain, *Correspondance,* II, 14-16) quotes a portion of his letter to Hincmar: "Hilmeradus . . . quem rex Ambianensium episcopum jussit . . . Nam, licet desit ei forsitan aliquid eruditionis, tamen poterit esse utilis, cum et vestrae doctrinae parebit . . ." Levillain dates *Epist.*

there is record of his having communicated with his suffragan, Bishop Ermenfrid of Beauvais, concerning the election of a successor to Ragenar who could be canonically consecrated. If this letter is plausibly dated after the archbishop had learned of the royal nomination, it indicates that he sought to regularize the situation at Amiens by naming Ermenfrid visitor to the electors of the diocese whose subsequent choice of Hilmerad at a regular election would bestow canonical status upon the crown's nominee.[11]

With the death of Bishop Folcuin on December 14, 855, Thérouanne was deprived of its shepherd and a fourth vacancy opened

---

74 at the end of June or July, 849, apparently following *Gallia christiana,* X, 1159, which places the selection of Hilmerad in June, 849. An instance of nomination by King Charles which does seek the metropolitan's approval is provided by Lupus of Ferrières, *Epist.* 26 (Levillain, I, 122-128). Herein there is evidence of the monarch's having named Bernus as Bishop of Autun and Godelsad as Bishop of Châlons-sur-Saône in 842, yet also reference to an effort to obtain the consent of the Metropolitan Amulus of Lyons. The last mention of Hilmerad's predecessor, Ragenar, is in connection with the Kiersy synod which met before Easter, 849; cf. Hincmar's *De praedestinatione,* ii (*PL* 125, 85B). Unfortunately, little light on the Amiens prelates of this period is provided by the local archives. Mlle. Simone Lecoanet, whose thesis, "Les actes des évêques d'Amiens jusqu'au début du XIIIᵉ siècle," was recently presented at the École des Chartes (*Positions des thèses soutenues par les élèves de la promotion de 1957* [Paris, 1957], pp. 83-85), kindly informs me (July 29, 1958): "j'ai trouvé un seul acte émanant d'un évêque d'Amiens avant le XIᵉ siècle, c-a-d, la fondation de l'abbaye de Corbie au VIIᵉ s."

[11] *Epist.* 27, to Ermenfrid of Beauvais (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 9): "pro electione pastoris Ambianensis canonice consecrandi post obitum Ragenarii presulis." Ertl, the editor, follows Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 520, n. 31, in assigning this letter of the archbishop to the middle of 849. Weise, *Koenigtum und Bischofswahl,* p. 45 n., suggests that Hilmerad was elected at Amiens subsequently to his nomination by King Charles. A parallel case, wherein Charles the Bald named Aeneas Bishop of Paris sometime after March 7, 856, and the diocese then elected him, can be found in Lupus of Ferrières, *Epists.* 92-93 (Levillain, *Correspondance,* II, 94-102). Hilmerad was certainly Bishop of Amiens by March 30, 850, when he is mentioned in a local grant as "venerabilis vir Helmeradus episcopus" (Joseph Roux, *Cartulaire du chapitre de la cathédrale d'Amiens* [Amiens, 1905], I, 1-5). Hilmerad also subscribes a letter addressed to Duke Nomenoius (Lupus of Ferrières, *Epist.* 81; Levillain, *Correspondance,* II, 56) which, though sometimes assigned to November, 849, more probably belongs to July-August, 850; cf. J. Hefele-H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* (Paris, 1911), IV, 1311, 1320. It would seem to be on the basis of this letter that Edmond Soyez, *Notices sur les évêques d'Amiens* (Amiens, 1878), pp. 26, 27, dates the death of Ragenar and the accession of Hilmerad in 849.

within the provincial episcopate.[12] Two letters bear witness that Hincmar took measures to secure for the diocese a canonical election. His invitation, issued probably in January or February, 856, to Bishop Theoderich of Cambrai to participate in the consecration of Humfrid for Thérouanne is proof of the archbishop's acceptance of Humfrid and may well imply that Humfrid was the choice of the diocesan electors.[13]

Our knowledge of the happenings at Châlons-sur-Marne following the decease of Bishop Lupus (between 853-858, possibly in 856 or 857) is, unfortunately, most inadequate. The Archbishop of Rheims is known to have written to King Charles the Bald on behalf of a regular election for the bereaved bishopric. That he obtained his request may, perhaps, be surmised—but only surmised—from the approval he extended the new bishop, Erkenraus, to whose consecration he summoned Bishop Theoderich of Cambrai.[14]

---

[12] The tenth century *Vita Folquini* (*MGH, SS,* XV, 429, 430) dates Folcuin's death in 855: "indictione tertia, feria septima . . . 18 kal. Ian." and reproduces the epitaph which records his death-date as "die quarto decimo Decembris." Since the 18 kal. Ian. in 855 was December 15, and a Sunday, *Gallia christiana,* X, 1533, corrects the date to 19 kal. Ian. (December 14), which was a Saturday (feria VII). Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 135, and van Werveke, *Het bisdom Terwaan,* 136, opine for December 15. Bled, *Regestes des évêques de Thérouanne,* I, p. 54, n. 89, accepts December 14, 855, which I also accept because of the concurrence between the epitaph notation and the *feria septima.*

[13] *Epist.* 92, to Hilduin, archchaplain to Charles the Bald (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 42): "ut certare procuret apud regem pro electione canonica ecclesiae Morinensi concedenda, quia et ipse hoc agere satageret quantum posset"; *Epist.* 93, to Bishop Pardulus of Laon (*ibid.,* 43): "pro ecclesia Morini vacante pastore, ut inde cum rege loquatur, qualiter ipsa electio rite peragatur." Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 525, nn. 96, 97, assigns the first letter to 855-856, the second to 856. They follow closely upon the death of Folcuin. *Epist.* 94, to Bishop Theoderich of Cambrai (*ibid.,* 43): "pro ordinatione Hunfridi in episcopatu Morini." Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 136, places Humfrid's consecration in January or February, 856, which is required if Humfrid's death occurred in the fifteenth year of his episcopate and the thirtieth regnal year of Charles the Bald; cf. note 44, below. Bled, *Regestes des évêques de Thérouanne,* I, 54-55, nn. 91, 92, considers Humfrid the nominee of the crown and the elect of clergy and people (856). *Hunfridus venerabilis episcopus* is the addressee of one of the forms of a capitulary given at Kiersy on February 14, 857 (*MGH, Capit.,* II, 286 n., with Sirmond's note in S. Baluze, *Capitularia regum francorum* [Paris, 1677], II, 776).

[14] *Epist.* 95 (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 43): "in epistola quam scripsit post obitum ipsius (Lupus) ad regem Karolum pro impetranda electione regulari ecclesiae Catalaunensi"; *Epist.* 96, to Theoderich of Cambrai (*ibid.*): "pro ordinatione

A sixth vacancy in the province came to an end when Hincmar, nephew to the archbishop, succeeded Bishop Pardulus (who died sometime after February 6, 857, possibly even after January 24, 858) as prelate of Laon. Since the younger Hincmar was already a bishop by March, 858, the summons to his consecration forwarded by the uncle to Bishop Rothad of Soissons cannot be any later than the first months of 858.[15] The archbishop himself witnesses that his nephew was the elect of the Laon clergy and laity. Even in later years, when conflict glowed between the two Hincmars and the older prelate listed at length his complaints against the younger, never once is there the suggestion that Hincmar of Laon was made by other than canonical means.[16]

Ercamrai post decessum Lupi Catalaunensis episcopi." Lupus is last mentioned in a document of May 1, 853 (Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* I, 404-405). É. de Barthélemy, *Diocèse ancien de Châlons-sur-Marne* (Paris, 1861), I, 342, dates the death of Lupus and the accession of Erkenraus in 856, with which Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 567, n. 38, agrees, though he also assigns (*ibid.,* p. 572, n. 70) Erkenraus' election to c. 857. *Gallia christiana,* IX, 866, places both events c. 857. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 98, cannot set the termini for Lupus and Erkenraus any more exactly than 853-858. Erkenraus first appears as a bishop at Kiersy in November, 858 (*MGH, Capit.,* II, 427; cf. *MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 64), he also is mentioned in a royal diploma of February 5, 859 ("Cartulaire de Saint-Étienne de Châlons," in *Mémoires de la société d'agriculture, commerce, sciences et arts du département de la Marne,* année 1895 [Châlons, 1896], pp. 165-166) which Tessier (*Recueil,* II, 587-589) is inclined to regard as correct as to date. Marie-Josèphe Gut-Bondil's, "Les actes des évêques de Châlons des origines à 1201" (École des Chartes, *Positions des thèses soutenues par les élèves de la promotion de 1955* [Paris, 1955], pp. 47-48), gives the impression that few, if any, archival materials are extant prior to the eleventh century. A request for information on the Châlons prelates of the ninth century, addressed to Madame Gut-Bondil at Beauvais (Oise), has not, unfortunately, elicited a reply.

[15] *Epist.* 109, to Bishop Rothad of Soissons (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 55): "pro ordinatione Hincmari post obitum Parduli Laudunensis episcopi." *Opusculum LV capitulorum,* preface (*PL* 126, 292C) testifies that the older Hincmar consecrated the younger at St. Mary's Cathedral, Laon. Pardulus of Laon is last mentioned on February 6, 857 (Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* I, 499-501), though a falsified act, dated January 24, 858 (Tessier, II, 575-80), speaks of Pardulus as alive. Saincir, *Diocèse de Soissons,* II, 559, places Pardulus' death in 857. On March 21, 858, Hincmar was already Bishop of Laon (*MGH, Capit.,* II, 296).

[16] *Epist. to Hadrian II,* September, 871 (*PL* 126, 642D): "coepit enim (Hincmar of Laon) clericos et laicos, qui eum elegerant, per varias occasiones affligere . . ."; cf. also Council of Douzy, *Epist. to Hadrian II,* September 6, 871

The death of Bishop Ermenfrid of Beauvais, which caused a seventh vacancy in the Province of Rheims, can be assigned with great probability to June 25, 859.[17] That his successor, Odo, was canonically elected, having had a valid *decretum* drawn up in his favor after one Fromold, the original choice of the diocesan electors, had been rejected as unqualified, is witnessed to by the Archbishop of Rheims. When Odo was consecrated is not touched upon, though deduction points to sometime prior to November, 860.[18]

(P. Labbe-G. Cossart, *Sacrosancta concilia* [Paris, 1671], VIII, 1654B): "electione cleri et plebis Laudunensis ecclesiae, cum favore domni regis Caroli, ad apicem episcopatus provexit." The charge is made by the Metropolitans of Lorraine, *Epist. to Hincmar of Rheims,* prior to March 15, 863 (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 762D) that the younger Hincmar was "ambitione atque favore potentatus inthronizatus" at Laon, but it is also laid against his uncle at Rheims and would seem to be the result of irritation. The older Hincmar's charges against the younger are found in *Opusculum LV capitulorum,* early 870 (*PL* 126, 290-494), *Epist. to Hincmar of Laon,* November, 870 (*ibid.,* 498-509), *Libellus expostulationis,* August, 871 (*ibid.,* 566-634).

[17] Ermenfrid's murder by the Danes in 859—June 25 is known as the obit from a Beauvais calendar (cf. L.-H. Labande, *Histoire de Beauvais et de ses institutions communales* [Paris, 1892], p. 21)—is attested to by the *Annales Bertiniani,* sub anno (ed. G. Waitz, in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum* [Hanover, 1883], p. 52). Because the acts of the Council of Tuzey, October 22, 860 (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 705E) bear Ermenfrid's signature, Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 121, confesses: "Je ne vois pas comment on pourrait résoudre ce conflit des dates." For Levillain, *Examen critique des chartes de Corbie,* p. 340, however, credence must be given to the *Annales,* though he had earlier (*Examen,* 114) favored the reliability of Tuzey. F. Lot, "Le grande invasion normande de 856-862," in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes,* 69 (1908), 33-34, provides a serious justification of the accuracy of the *Annales* in this matter. It is true that P. Grierson, "Eudes I^re^, évêque de Beauvais," in *Le Moyen Age,* 45 (1935), 166, Labande, *Histoire de Beauvais,* p. 7, and F. Vercauteren, *Étude sur les civitates de Belgique Seconde,* p. 272, place Ermenfrid's death in June, 861, and Delettre, *Histoire du diocèse de Beauvais,* I, 346-7, in 861, without mention of the month, but all four assume the genuinity of the Tuzey signatures. In the light of the text from Hincmar, however, which is given in note 19, below, any position based upon the Tuzey signatures is open to challenge. Prior to the questionable Tuzey document, Ermenfrid last appears at the Council of Savonnières on June 14, 859 (*MGH, Capit.,* II, 450).

[18] The canonicity of Odo's election follows from Hincmar's comparison of the situation at Beauvais in 881 with the events, a score of years earlier, leading up to Odo's selection. The comparison appears in *Epist.* XIX, June, 881 (*PL* 126, 110B): "Episcopi . . . convenimus (at Fismes, April, 881) . . . relecta praesumptione cleri et plebis ecclesiae Belvacensis, qui personam (Honoratus, cf.

Though there are sound reasons for accepting as valid the assertion of the *Annales Bertiniani* that Bishop Immo of Noyon was slain by the Danes in 859—late August seems indicated—the prelate's name, along with that of his successor, Raginelm, appears appended to the acts of the Council of Tuzey which opened on October 22, 860. A solution to the contradiction is provided by the Archbishop of Rheims who bluntly affirms that the Tuzey signatures are forgeries and that Raginelm was not as yet a bishop at the time of the synod.[19]

114D) regulis sacris incongruam, cum decreto singulorum manibus roborato, nobis praesentaverunt in synodo, veluti jam fuit actum, quando Fromoldum quemdam elegerunt, et rejecto illo propter insipientiam et improbitatem, Odo ex vicina parochia ibidem cum decreto canonico fuit electus . . ." It is possible that the *veluti jam fuit actum* implies a synodal rejection of Fromold, which may have occurred at Tuzey in October, 860, at which Hincmar was present; cf. his *Libellus expostulationis,* xviii (*LP* 126, 590D). Odo's election, therefore, may not have been prior to October, 860. Levillain, *Correspondance de Loup de Ferrières,* II, 136 n., 185 n., believes that Odo became Bishop of Beauvais in 859, subsequent to October. *Gallia christiana,* IX, 698, suggests late 860 or early 861. Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* 574, n. 93, and Delettre, *Histoire du diocèse de Beauvais,* I, 348-351, opine that the election of Odo occurred in 861. Grierson, in *Le Moyen Age,* 45 (1935), 166, is constrained by a faulty evaluation of the Tuzey signatures to retard Odo's accession to sometime after June 25, 861, and in this he is unreflectingly followed by Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* II, 200. Odo was certainly Bishop of Beauvais when the Carolingian monarchs met at Savonnières in October-November, 862 (*MGH, Capit.,* II, 159). A study of the names, listed according to seniority, in Hincmar's *Epist.* XXVI (*PL* 126, 172A), in the consecration document for Hedenulph of Laon (*ibid.,* 276C), in the Council of Douzy, 871 (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 1649, 1653B), indicates that Odo was senior to Bishop Raginelm of Noyon and thus, probably, consecrated prior to November 7, 860; cf. note 20, below.

[19] The slaying of Immo in 859 is recorded by *Annales Bertiniani,* sub anno (ed. Waitz, p. 52). For a defense of the accuracy of the *Annales,* cf. note 17, above. Both J. Warichez, *Les origines de l'église de Tournai,* p. 79, who implies that Immo died between October 22-November 7, 860, and F. Vercauteren, *Étude sur les civitates de la Belgique Seconde,* p. 170, who places his death in 861 are, therefore, in error. Among the Tuzey *subscriptiones episcoporum* (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 705CD) appear those of "Rainelmus Noviomagensium episcopus" and of "Immo Noviomagorum episcopus." That they are fraudulent follows from Hincmar's *Libellus expostulationis,* xviii (*PL* 126, 589-90): "schedulam quamdam mihi direxit (Hincmar of Laon) . . . quae confecta est quasi ex nomine synodi apud Tusiacum, quam . . . numquam vidi, et nunquam vel nusquam audivi . . . Quae schedula . . . etiam ex hoc mendax esse patenter ostenditur, quia eorum episcoporum nomina ibi habentur subscripta, qui nondum erant episcopi, et etiam duorum episcoporum nomina ex una civitate, et uno tempore ibi sunt posita. . . . Et inscribitur ibi nomen Rainelmi Noviomagensium,

Unfortunately, Hincmar neither tells us how soon after Tuzey nor in what manner Raginelm was made Bishop of Noyon. From Raginelm's subscribing a *privilegium* of November 7, 860, it may be that his consecration followed shortly upon the synod. From the fact that the archbishop named Raginelm an episcopal visitor for a canonical election at Thérouanne in 870 it would seem improbable that there was any irregularity about Raginelm's own accession to Noyon.[20]

Though the metropolitan See of Rheims lay within the domains of Charles the Bald, its suffragan diocese, Cambrai, had been subject, since August, 843, to the Emperor Lothar I in his capacity as monarch of the Middle Kingdom. Sometime during the years prior to Lothar's death (which occurred on September 29, 855), Hincmar had written to one Count Maio, asking him to use his good offices with the emperor toward securing a canonical election at Cambrai in the event of Bishop Theoderich's death.[21] That the archbishop did have cause for anxiety appears from his correspondence with King Lothar II (who succeeded his father, the emperor, in 855) and with Archbishop

---

qui nondum erat episcopus, deinde longe post, nomen Immonis Noviomagorum inscribitur, cui Rainelmus successit." Since the *subscriptiones* include his own, Hincmar's "numquam vidi, nusquam audivi" is evidence enough of a forgery. There is another instance of fraudulent episcopal signatures, including those of Hincmar and Raginelm, in Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* II, 645.

[20] A *privilegium* for St. Martin of Tours Abbey, dated November 7, 860, bears Raginelm's signature as Bishop of Tournai (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 706). The title was, indeed, used by Noyon prelates (cf. note 4, above). J. Warichez, "Les fastes épiscopaux de Tournai," in *Collationes dioecesis Tornacensis,* 21 (1925-26), 202, accepts the *privilegium* as evidence that Raginelm was already a bishop by November 7, 860. I think it probable, yet I cannot altogether exclude the possibility that his signature was appended to the document at a later date. Raginelm's next appearance is in a *privilegium* for the Abbey of St. Denys (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 758B) which emanates from the Synod of Pistes-Soissons, during the closing months of 862. His commission for the Thérouanne election of 870 is digested in Flodoard, *Historia Remensis ecclesiae,* III, 23 (*MGH, Scriptores* [*SS*], XIII, 532): "Ragenelino Noviomagensi . . . pro visitatione Morinensis ecclesiae post obitum Hunfridi episcopi iuxta dispositionem regis."

[21] *Epist.* 70 (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 37): "Maioni . . . comiti gratiarum referens actiones . . . petitque, ut, si in eorum diebus idem Dei servus (Bishop Theoderich) ad communem Dominum transiret, pro electione concedenda clero et plebi ecclesiae ipsius apud Lotharium imperatorem satageret." Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 523, n. 69, can date this only 845-855. For the inclusion of Cambrai in Lothar's realm, cf. Lesne, "Hincmar et l'empereur Lothaire," in *Revue des questions historiques,* 78 (1905), 5.

Gunthar of Cologne wherein Hincmar sought such a regular election after a ninth vacancy had been created in the Rheims province by the death of Theoderich on August 5, 862.[22] Neither complied with the Rheims request. We know of Hincmar's writing a second and then a third time to Gunthar (probably in the course of 862) to protest that he would not tolerate any but a canonically made prelate at Cambrai.[23]

It may be—although the source, the eleventh-century *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium,* is not always accurate—that Lothar II first bestowed Cambrai upon the cleric Guntbert and then, faced by strong action on the part of the Archbishop of Rheims, upon the cleric Tetbold who, in his turn, had to withdraw because of Hincmar's opposition.[24] Contemporary records, however, witness that a protracted contest between the Rheims metropolitan and the Lorraine monarch was fought over the cleric Hilduin who certainly occupied the Cambrai see in the fall of 862. Hincmar was strongly convinced of Hilduin's unsuitability for the episcopate and at a gathering of the Carolingian sovereigns at Savonnières, which terminated on November 3, 862, he presented Lothar with a detailed indictment of Hilduin.[25] That Hilduin was not the elect of the diocese but an intruder sustained by Lothar II is known from Pope Nicholas I who intervened, within a matter of some ten months, both by threatening the excommunication of Hilduin and by commanding that the clergy and laity of Cambrai be permitted to choose their own prelate.[26] The papal interposition seems to have met some success for King Lothar was thereafter in communication with Hincmar to inform him that Hilduin had dispatched a messenger to the pope and that nothing further would be done in the Cambrai matter until Rome had given its verdict.[27] There is reason for thinking that Hilduin himself left Cambrai not long after; at least we hear of the cleric of the same name at Rome with Archbishop Gunthar of Cologne in 864.[28] Yet even though the intruder was probably no longer in residence, Cambrai seems not to have enjoyed a canonical election or, at least, not to have witnessed the consecration of a canonical prelate as late as April, 865.[29]

---

[22] *Epist* 151, to Lothar II (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 119): "pro electione episcopi ecclesiae concedenda Camaracensi"; *Epist.* 152, to Archbishop Gunthar (*ibid.*): "ut intercedat apud Lotharium regem et satagat pro electione canonica Cameracensis episcopi post decessum Theoderici . . ." Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 113, and Warichez, "Les fastes épiscopaux de Cambrai," in *Collationes dioecesis Tornacensis,* 21 (1925-1926), 296, follow the *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium,* I, 49 (*MGH, SS,* VII, 418) in wrongly assigning Theoderich's death to August 5, 863. But Hincmar's protest against the occupancy of Cambrai by Hilduin, a protest presented at Savonnières no later than November 3, 862, shows that Theoderich was already dead in 862; cf. Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* pp. 571-572, n. 67, and R. Parisot, *Le royaume de Lorraine sous les Carolingiens* (Paris, 1899), p. 201. August 5, however, would seem to be proper for the obit.

[23] *Epist.* 154, to Gunthar (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 119): "secundo vel tertio pro hac eadem re (see *Epist.* 152), adfirmans nonnisi regulariter in diebus suis illic episcopum ordinandum." Despite Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 572, and Ertl's note to the *MGH* edition, it is not "ganz einleuchtend" that Hincmar is here protesting the intrusion of Hilduin at Cambrai. If Guntbert and Tetbold actually held Cambrai for a time (see the next note), these letters may have been directed against their occupancy.

[24] *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium,* I, 50 (*MGH, SS,* VII, 418): "Siquidem imperator cuidam clerico Guntberto episcopii contulit dignitatem; sed archiepiscopus cum suis coepiscopis, hoc fieri contra sacros canones advertens, cum omni auctoritate refragatus est, cunctisque ipsius aecclesiae clericis ac militibus sub anathemate interdixit, ne quis eorum cum adultero pastore ullum assensum aut familiaritatem habere putasset. . . . Quare non diu moratus, invitus abscessit. Dehinc vero imperator Tetboldum quendam clericum intromisit, sed similiter ea contentione frustratus, exivit." The chronicle confuses Lothar II with his father, but it may not be in error regarding the two intruders. H. Lancelin, *Histoire du diocèse de Cambrai* (Valenciennes, 1946), p. 63, follows the account of the *Gesta* but does not attempt a chronology of the events at Cambrai between 862-866.

---

[25] Metropolitans of Lorraine, *Epist. to Hincmar of Rheims,* prior to March 15, 863 (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 762): "Relegimus . . . libellum tuae accusationis adversus Hilduinum dilectum filium et fratrem nostrum . . . in quo ipsum officio pastorali indignum asseveras, et causas te scire, pro quibus isdem electus ordinari non debeat, exclamas. . . . Te enim exspoliasti judicio, dum criminationis chartulam . . . propria manu . . . in conventu regum principi nostro Hlothario inconsulte porrexisti ac memoratum Hilduinum, nosque pariter suspectos reddidisti." It is clear from the foregoing that Hilduin enjoyed the support of the metropolitans, Theutgard of Trier, Gunthar of Cologne (to whom Hilduin was related), and Arduic of Besançon. He held Cambrai prior to the assembly of Savonnières which concluded on November 3, 862 (*MGH, Capit.,* II, 159-165), but how much earlier is not known. J. F. Böhmer-E. Mühlbacher, *Regesta imperii* (Innsbruck, 1889), I, n. 1262a, are content with 862 for Lothar's bestowal of Cambrai upon Hilduin. Neither Warichez, "Les fastes épiscopaux de Cambrai," in *Collationes dioecesis Tornacensis,* 21 (1925-1926), 296, nor E. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'église en Belgique* (2nd ed., Brussels, 1945), I, 260, make an effort to determine a chronology for Hilduin's occupancy.

[26] Pope Nicholas I, *Epist.* 13, to the bishops of Lorraine (*MGH, Epist.,* VI, 279-280): "didicimus quod . . . rex Hlotharius . . . ecclesiam Camaracensem cuidam Hilduino clerico dederit . . . Unde eadem ecclesia Camaracensis a iam fato Hilduino pervasa iam ultra decimum mensem . . . Quapropter praecipimus vobis ut suggeratis filio nostro Hlothario . . . quatenus iam fato Hilduino submoto ex se eligendi iuxta sacros canones episcopum clero et plebi ipsius ecclesiae licentiam tribuat." See also *Epists.* 14, 15 (*ibid.,* 280-282). Unfortunately, these papal letters are undated so that we cannot count back ten or more months to the commencement of Hilduin's occupancy. Ph. Jaffe-G. Wattenbach, *Regesta pontificum romanorum* (2nd ed., Graz, 1956), I, nn. 2730-32, suggest April 28, 863, for these letters, yet admit that the date "non satis constat." Actually, they cannot possibly be earlier than June, 863, though it is true that Bishop Odo of Beauvais, from whom the pope seems to have derived his knowledge of the Cambrai situation, had arrived in Rome by April 28, 863; cf. Jaffe-Wattenbach, I, n. 2717.

For reasons unknown to us, more than a year elapsed before Hincmar set the date of consecration for the priest John who, in the meantime, had been canonically chosen by the clergy and laity of Cambrai. At first July 7, 866, was selected for the episcopal ordination but, upon the failure of Bishop Hincmar of Laon to appear, the date was transferred three weeks to July 21.[30]

For the evidence it provides of the Archbishop of Rheims having been involved in what the Holy See judged to be the uncanonical making of a bishop, the conflict between Hincmar and his senior suffragan, Rothad II of Soissons (ca. 832-869, 870), proves enlightening.[31] The archbishop himself records, in the section of the *Annales Bertiniani* composed by him, the episcopal synods at Soissons and vicinity which excommunicated Rothad, in 861, and then, in 862, deposed him.[32] That following the deposition of the prelate the Diocese of Soissons was regarded as vacant, at least so regarded in the Province of Rheims, is shown in the consecration by Hincmar and his synodal colleagues of one Engelmod as successor to Rothad.[33] But the attitude of the Holy See was another matter. Not only did Pope Nicholas I not recognize Engelmod but he insisted upon Rothad's release from the monastic custody to which he had been delivered and upon his being allowed to come to Rome by May 1, 864, where he, Rothad, and his accusers would stand papal judgment.[34] Ultimately, in January, 865, the pontiff gave judgment in favor of Rothad and restored him to his see.[35] Thereupon the Archbishop of Rheims quietly submitted without anything more than an understandable grumble.[36] He did not, however, suffer the humiliation of having to dismiss the intruded successor to Rothad, for by the time of the papal decision, Engelmod was already dead.[37]

---

[27] Hincmar, *Epist.* 169, to Pope Nicholas, early 864 (*MGH, Epist.*, VIII, 144): ". . . donec regiis suis (Lothar's) litteris mihi respondit Hilduinum ad vestram auctoritatem suum legatum misisse et nihil aliter de praefata ecclesia (Cambrai) nisi ut egerat disponere debuisse, donec a vobis inde responsum acciperet." Böhmer-Mühlbacher, *Regesta imperii,* I, n. 1267a, incline to the view that Hilduin's legate went to Rome about March, 863. However, it is more probable that it was later in the same year, after Hilduin had learned of the papal intervention.

[28] *Annales Bertiniani,* A.D. 864 (ed. Waitz, pp. 68, 70-71). With Parisot, *Le royaume de Lorraine,* p. 202, and E. Dümmler, *Geschichte des Ostfränkischen Reiches* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1887), II, 34, 74, it seems wise to identify the Hilduin who accompanies Gunthar in Rome with the intruder of Cambrai. However, F. Lot, "Les abbés Hilduin au IXe siècle," in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes,* 66 (1905), 280, suggests that this Hilduin was not the brother of Gunthar, as the *Annales Bertiniani* state, but rather his cousin.

[29] Pope Nicholas I, *Epist.* 38, ca. April 22, 865 (*MGH, Epist.*, VI, 312): "De Camaracensi (ecclesia) vero quod statutum habemus volumus observari, videlicet ut, si ibi electio canonica fuerit, consecrari debeat in ea episcopus."

[30] Hincmar, *Epist.* 183, to Hincmar of Laon, July 13, 866 (*MGH, Epist.*, VIII, 173): "clerus ac plebs Camaracensis ecclesiae cum decreto canonico petierunt sibi ordinari episcopum Iohannem presbiterum," which testifies to the regularity of John's election and also specifically mentions the two dates for consecration. H. Lancelin, *Histoire du diocèse de Cambrai* (Valenciennes, 1946), p. 64, has nothing on the election. John's consecration is noted by the *Annales Laubienses,* A.D. 866 (*MGH, SS,* IV, 14). In August, 866, he attended the synod of Soissons as Bishop of Cambrai (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 836E).

---

[31] For the conflict cf. L. V. Pécheur, *Annales du diocèse de Soissons* (Soissons, 1863), I, 432-451, Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* pp. 237-270, Dümmler, *Geschichte des Ostfränk. Reiches,* II, 88-96, K. Hefele-H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* (Paris, 1911), IV, 296-310, 343-359, Horace Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages* (2nd ed., St. Louis, 1925), III, 83-89, and Emile Amann, *L'époque carolingienne* (Paris, 1947), pp. 383-388. Rothad II is used to distinguish this prelate from an earlier Bishop of Soissons present at the Synod of Noyon in 814.

[32] *Annales Bertiniani,* A.D. 861, 862 (ed. Waitz, pp. 56, 59). Neither Pécheur, *Annales du diocèse de Soissons,* I, 438, nor Jules Saincir, *Le diocèse de Soissons* (Évreux, 1935), I, 42, attempt to date the deposing synod exactly. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* IV, 307, suggest that it met "dans les derniers mois de 862," which accords with the data considered in the next note.

[33] Pope Nicholas I, *Epist.* 57, to the bishops of the Soissons synod, ca. April 28, 863 (*MGH, Epist.,* VI, 358): "Sed quid mirum haec . . . ut post appellationem et reclamationem eiusdem Rothadi in cathedra ipsius alterum consecraretis . . ."; *Epist.* 58, to Hincmar, same date (*ibid.,* 363): "Debuerat certe beatitudo tua . . . saltem post appellationem cathedrae ipsius, qui videbatur eiectus, alterum episcopum non ordinasses . . ." Rothad of Soissons, *Libellus proclamationis,* November-December, 864 (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 788): "Denique saepefatus archiepiscopus meus . . . jam mihi . . . judicium depositionis emisit. . . . Interea ordinatur episcopus in cathedra viventis . . ." Cumulatively, these references point to the consecration of a successor to Rothad by Hincmar and his suffragans at the Council of Soissons. Nothing proves or disproves an election of the new prelate by the Diocese of Soissons. The name: *Angilmodus Suessionicae ecclesiae episcopus,* appears upon two documents confirming royal donations to the Parisian monastery of St. Denys which documents emanate from the Soissons synod (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 758D, 760C). Since Charles the Bald's donation to St. Denys dates from September 19, 862 (Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* II, 56-67), the synod must have met, or continued to meet, after this date.

[34] The papal letters are catalogued in Jaffe-Wattenbach, *Regesta pontificum romanorum,* I, nn. 2712-3, 2721-3, 2727, 2737-40, 2756. Hincmar's own account

Hincmar's concern to secure a canonical election at Châlons-sur-Marne in 868 after King Charles the Bald had given the diocese to the priest Willebert is singular witness to the value that the archbishop placed upon the prescriptions of canon law. Not long after the death—probably in October, 868—of Bishop Erkenraus of Châlons had created an eleventh vacancy among the prelates of the Rheims province,[38] King Charles bestowed the see upon Willebert, one of his palace clergy. Faced thus with a royal nominee, and having made a

---

of the affair is found in *Epist.* 160, February-March, 863 (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, 122-140), and *Epist.* 169, early 864 (*ibid.,* 144-163). A letter of King Charles the Bald (Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* II, 81) informed Pope Nicholas that in accord with the papal command the Synod of Verberie, October 25, 863, had decreed that Rothad and his accusers be dispatched to Rome.

[35] Pope Nicholas I, *Epists.* 68-72 (*MGH, Epist.,* VI, 382-401).

[36] Hincmar describes Rothad, in the *Annales Bertiniani,* A.D. 865 (ed. Waitz, p. 76) as "a Nicolao papa non regulariter sed potentialiter restitutus," yet notes that "sine interrogatione vel consensu episcoporum qui eum deposuerunt . . . Rothadus est in sede sua remissus." In fairness to Hincmar, it should be said that his *Epist.* 169 of early 864 (*MGH, Epist.,* VIII, especially pp. 151, 155) shows him fully prepared beforehand to submit to the papal decision. His loyal acceptance of Rome's judgment is manifest in his correspondence with Rothad as well as with his other suffragans on December 29, 867; cf. his *Epist.* 203 (*ibid.,* 227).

[37] This appears from Pope Nicholas, *Epist.* 69, ca. end of January, 865 (*MGH, Epist.,* VI, 388): "praedia sanctae Suessonicae ecclesiae iuri competentia ab invasore ibidem consecrato extitissent pro libitu disposita et . . . etiam eo iusto Dei iudicio decedente . . . quibusdam hominibus aeque in beneficio collata." That Engelmod was dead even prior to May, 864, seems probable from Nicholas, *Epist.* 66, to Hincmar, May, 864 (*ibid.,* 378): "nam et alterum episcopum post illum qui suam sedem in eius eiectione suscepit, ibi non consecres, donec coram nobis de eo . . . tractemus." *Gallia christiana,* IX, 344, and Pécheur, *Annales du diocèse de Soissons,* I, 450, imply that Engelmod's death occurred prior to Rothad's return to Soissons.

[38] Erkenraus is last mentioned on September 27, 868 (Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* II, 198-199, falsely dated September 27, 869, by the "Cartulaire de Saint-Étienne de Châlons," in *Mémoires de la société d'agriculture* [Châlons], année 1895, p. 168). Without indicating his source, Éd. de

virtue of necessity, the diocesan electors wrote to the monarch and recorded their own choice of Willebert, but failed to forward the required *decretum canonicum* (the official document of election) to Archbishop Hincmar. The omission could not, in any case, have been avoided since an episcopal visitor had not witnessed the election. When Hincmar learned of Châlons' action, he set about regularizing the situation. Bishop Odo of Beauvais was sent to the diocese with authorization to act as canonical visitor in carrying through a proper election.[39] The re-election of Willebert did, in fact, take place and a correct *decretum* was drawn up in the presence of Bishop Odo, who then accompanied Willebert to Kiersy where the archbishop and the suffragan bishops of the province examined and approved him on December 3, 868, setting December 5 for his consecration.[40]

Rothad II of Soissons, whom we have seen deposed in 862 by Hincmar and his colleagues only to be reinstated in 865 by Pope Nicholas I, passed from this life sometime after April 30, 869.[41]

Barthélemy, *Diocèse ancien de Châlons-sur-Marne* (Paris, 1861), I, 342, assigns Erkenraus' death to October 7, 868. Since Willebert was twice chosen by the Châlons electorate prior to December 3, 868, probability favors Erkenraus' decease in October.

[39] Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis eccl.*, III, 23 (*MGH, SS*, XIII, 530) thus digests Hincmar's letter to Bishop Odo: "de ordinatione Willeberti, cui rex episcopium Catalaunense dederat, ne in ipsius ordinatione ab ordine debito declinaret, intimans, quod inrationabiliter Catalaunenses post obitum sui episcopi de sua ipsa necessitate fecerint, et quod ad regem litteras suas pro electione praefati Willeberti miserint, decretum vero suum ad archiepiscopum, sicut mittere debuerant, ut inde quae agenda essent canonice ageret, non miserint; insinuans, qualiter inde rite facere debuissent; sed quia non fecerant, quid exinde cautius agendum sibi videatur, edisserit; et prudenter adtendendum mandat, ut regularis electio fiat, et postremo, sicut ipsius prudentiae melius inde videretur, hanc ita disponeret." Schrörs, *Hinkmar*, p. 534, n. 222, places this letter in November, 868.

[40] Cf. the *Examinatio Willeberti Catalaunensis ordinandi episcopi* (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 1878-1881), wherein Hincmar explains (1879C): "pro qua causa duae electiones in eadem ecclesia factae fuerint, scilicet quia prima non regulariter facta extiterit, quoniam decretum non canonice factum fuit, sed postea misso ad eadem ecclesiam visitatore Hodone episcopo, et votis omnium in unum concordantibus, aliud decretum, quod canonicum foret, fieri praecepit."

[41] Rothad of Soissons' signature appears on a *privilegium* for the monastery of Charroux, dated April 30, 869 (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 1528B) as well as on a diploma of Bishop Odo of Beauvais in favor of his canons of St. Peter's, dated March 1, 875 (Labbe-Cossart, IX, 279D). The eighteenth-century Canon Cabaret, *Mém. mss. pour servir à l'histoire de Soissons*, I, 79, cited by L. V. Pécheur, *Annales du diocèse de Soissons* (Soissons, 1863), I, 464, adduces

Unfortunately, there is very little information concerning the making of his successor, still, Flodoard had seen a letter of the archbishop which seems to have commissioned Bishop Odo of Beauvais to act as visitor for a canonical election at Soissons after the death of Rothad II.[42] At least from June, 870, until 883 the see was occupied by Bishop Hildebald. That he was recognized by Hincmar as canonical occupant of Soissons appears from his signing along with the archbishop the acts of the Synod of Attigny on June 25, 870, and those of Douzy in August, 871.[43]

The thirteenth episcopal vacancy within the Province of Rheims during Hincmar's tenure occurred at Thérouanne with the death of

---

this latter document as evidence that Soissons was governed by a Bishop Rothad III in 875. Because Pécheur is well aware (pp. 464, 493) that the Bishop of Soissons from 870 until after Hincmar's death was Hildebald, he suggests that the diploma of 875 must belong to 870 and that Rothad III could have held the see only from 868-869 to 870. Jules Saincir, *Le diocèse de Soissons* (Évreux, 1935), I, 43, dates the death of Rothad II in 868 and speaks of a Rothad III who signs the *privilegium* of 869 but whose "passage sur le siège épiscopal fut de courte durée, car en 870, Hildebold lui avait succédé." In the final analysis, the evidence for Rothad III stands or falls with Bishop Odo's diploma. By all standards the diploma is forged. It carries a suspect warning: "maximeque successoribus nostris" and is suscribed by a multitude of bishops long since dead, e.g., Immo of Noyon (died 859), Lupus of Châlons (d. 853-858), Folcuin of Thérouanne (d. 855), Theoderich of Cambrai (d. 862), Ragenar of Amiens (d. 849), Erpuin of Senlis (d. 872). Delettre, *Histoire du diocèse de Beauvais,* I, 363 n., has rightly raised a question as to the authenticity of Odo's diploma. I would suggest that it belongs in the same category of Beauvais forgeries as those published in Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* II, pp. 639 ff., 655 ff. Rothad III may, therefore, be considered non-existent. His pontificate does not find place in *Gallia christiana,* IX, 343, or in J.F.M. Lequeux, *Antiquités religieuses du diocèse de Soissons et Laon* (Paris, 1859), I, 14, or in Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 91, all of whom properly extend the episcopate of Rothad II to 869. Though Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* pp. 269, 575, n. 93, dates Rothad II's death either in 869-871 or ca. September, 869, we are certain only that it fell after April 30, 869, and before June 25, 870.

[42] Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis eccl.,* III, 23 (*MGH, SS,* XIII, 530), to Odo of Beauvais: "pro electione Suessorum episcopi post obitum Rothadi"; dated 869-870 by Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 538, n. 272.

[43] Cf. the signatures of Attigny (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 1841-1842), which mark Hildebald's first appearance, and those of Douzy (*ibid.,* 1652-1653). Pécheur, *Annales du diocèse de Soissons,* I, 464, and Saincir, *Diocèse de Soissons,* I, 43, place Hildebald's accession in 870; Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 91, notes that the known extremes of the episcopate are 870-883.

Bishop Humfrid on March 8, 870.[44] Flodoard has digested a letter from the archbishop to Bishop Raginelm of Noyon appointing him, after royal nomination, visitor to the bereaved diocese. Normally, this would imply that a local cleric was to be chosen for the episcopate, yet here at Thérouanne something else was in the offing.[45]

Early in 868, Pope Hadrian II had appealed, among others, to Hincmar of Rheims, on behalf of Bishop Actard of Nantes who was the victim of marauding Bretons, Danes, and pirates. In so many words, the pope authorized Actard's transfer from Nantes to any other vacant see.[46] The Archbishop of Rheims is witness that the papal request was honored and that, by action of a synod, Actard, though not incardinated in the Province of Rheims, was permitted to exercise his ministry in the suffragan See of Thérouanne until such time as the

---

[44] Alard Tassar (d. 1532), whose mss is employed by Bled, *Regestes des évêques de Thérouanne,* I, 54, dates Humfrid's death as "viii martiarum idus, episcopatus sui xv anno, VIIIcLXIX, indict. ii." Bled (p. 57, n. 111) works this out to March 8, 869. While the second indiction corresponds to 869, the fifteenth year of Humfrid's episcopate could have commenced, at the earliest, only in December, 869. Van Werveke, *Het bisdom Terwaan,* p. 34, finds that Humfrid's death fell in the thirtieth regnal year of Charles the Bald and must, therefore, be subsequent to June, 869. Van Werveke rightly concludes that the true death date is March 8, 870, which is the chronology adopted by *Gallia christiana,* X, 1534, Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* 351 n., and Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 136. Since March 8, 870, is within the fifteenth year of Humfrid's episcopate, his consecration must have occurred sometime between December 15, 855, and March 7, 856, with the probability favoring the early part of 856.

[45] Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis eccl.,* III, 23 (*MGH, SS,* XIII, 532), to Raginelm of Noyon: "pro visitatione Morinensis ecclesiae post obitum Hunfridi episcopi iuxta dispositionem regis"; dated March, 870, by Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 538, n. 277. Van Werveke, *Het bisdom Terwaan,* p. 34, observes of this visitation: "Er werd echter geen nieuwe bisschop benoemd, maar van de gelegenheid werd gebruik gemaakt om aan een verjaagden bisschop een zetel te bezorgen." The *dispositio regis* may have involved not only the nomination of Raginelm but also the instruction that place was to be made at Thérouanne for Bishop Actard of Nantes.

[46] Pope Hadrian II, *Epists.* 7-9, February, 868 (*MGH, Epist.,* VI, 704-10), also, *Epist.* 10, to Hincmar, March 8, 868 (*ibid.,* 711): "Insta . . . apud . . . regem Karolum nostra vice impetrare studeto, uti suo quoque favore vacans ei (Actard) episcopalis, etiamsi se metropolis obtulerit, ecclesia tribuatur." Cf. *Annales Bertiniani,* A.D. 868 (ed. Waitz, pp. 91-92). In this, Hadrian was replying to a request made to his predecessor, Nicholas I, in Actard's favor by King Charles the Bald in October, 867 (Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* II, 176, also, *PL* 124, 875B). For Actard's troubles at Nantes, cf. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* II, 369-370.

Archdiocese of Tours sought him as its prelate and Pope Hadrian approved his transfer to the metropolis of Touraine.[47] Thus, an episcopate of Actard at Thérouanne is established. That it commenced officially in June, 870, at the Synod of Attigny, is most probable.[48] That it terminated with the transfer to Tours (whose clergy and people had already elected Actard) which was requested by the Council of Douzy on September 6, 871, and was authorized by Pope Hadrian II on December 26, 871, can be shown beyond question through records still extant.[49]

---

[47] Hincmar, *Epist. to Pope Hadrian,* September, 871 (*PL* 126, 641CD): "coepiscopum nostrum Actardum, sicut vestra dignatio exiguitati meae litteris suis praecepit . . . de sua sede expulsum, consensu coepiscoporum Rhemensis provinciae, ac favore domni nostri Caroli regis gloriosi, in vacante ecclesia (Morinensi) dioeceseos nostrae locum sacrificandi, et episcopale ministerium peragendi concessi. . . . In qua vacante ecclesia dioeceseos nostrae secundum apostolicas litteras vestras, incardinari non potuit. . . . Nunc autem quia clerus et plebs metropolis ecclesiae Turonensis . . . sibi eum incardinari deposcit . . . auctoritati vestrae remittimus." *Epist.* XXXI, 872 A.D. (*ibid.,* 218B): "Actardum a civitate sua expulsum, in vacante Morinensi ecclesia concilii consensu concessit aliquandiu immorari, donec petentibus clero ac plebe provinciae Turonensis . . . in vacante metropoli fuit incardinatus." The observation that Actard could not be incardinated at Thérouanne, the contrast between synodal consent to his temporary episcopate at Thérouanne and election by clergy and people of Tours would suggest that Actard had not been chosen for Thérouanne by the diocesan electors. Raginelm's visitation of Thérouanne in 870 may, therefore, have had as its purpose not an episcopal election but the securing of the diocese's consent to Actard's interim ministry.

[48] We still have the listing of bishops who signed a document at the Synod of Attigny on June 25, 870. Among them appears: *Ex Remensi provincia Actardus Morin. episc.* (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 1841E). Thus, Actard's coming to Thérouanne is no later than this date. Since his transfer was approved by a synod which had to be subsequent to Humfrid's death (cf. notes 44, 47), Attigny itself probably marks the official commencement of his Thérouanne episcopate. Bled, *Regestes des évêques de Thérouanne,* I, 58, n. 114, dates Actard's ministry at Thérouanne as early as April, 869, on the grounds that he subscribed the Synod of Verberie in that month. However, the documents of Verberie clearly establish that Actard signed as Bishop of Nantes; cf. Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 868A, 1528B. Van Werveke, *Het bisdom Terwaan,* p. 35, retards the commencement of Actard's episcopate at Thérouanne to September 15, 870. The Attigny signature destroys this contention, but it does not necessarily exclude the possibility that Actard's episcopal consecration at Nantes did fall on a September 15 (". . . Accardus, XVII Kal. octobris ordinatus") either in 843 or 844.

[49] The synodal request for Actard's transfer to Tours is found in *Epist. of the Council of Douzy,* September 6, 871 (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 1658CD); from this

With Actard's departure for Tours, Thérouanne was again vacant. This time an Adalbert succeeded to the see and made his profession of faith at the hands of the Archbishop of Rheims. Of Adalbert's acceptance by Hincmar we are certain, although, unfortunately, neither the details of his selection nor the exact date of his consecration are known to us.[50] Still, it may be proposed that Adalbert's choice and consecration must have been subsequent to the receipt of Pope Hadrian's letter of December 26, 871, which permitted Actard's departure for Tours (the receipt cannot be earlier than February, 872) and yet it must have been prior by some months to December, 872, since Adalbert was already an established bishop at a time when Hadebert of Senlis, consecrated on December 12, 872, was being referred to as "noviter ordinatus Hadelbertus."[51]

This reference to Hadebert also involves Bishop Gerold of Amiens in such fashion as to suggest that Gerold, too, had been conse-

---

time, Actard drops the designation of his see as Thérouanne and signs himself only as *Actardus episcopus* (*ibid.,* 1653A). The *gesta* of the Douzy synod were carried to Rome by Actard himself, cf. *Annales Bertiniani,* A.D. 871 (ed. Waitz, p. 117). Papal authorization for the transfer to Tours is extended by Hadrian II, *Epist.* 34, December 26, 871 (*MGH, Epist.,* VI, 738-40).

[50] The *Professio Adalberti futuri episcopi Morinensis Hincmaro Remorum archiepiscopo ante ordinationem oblata* (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 1881-1884) establishes Adalbert's acceptability to his archbishop, but is not dated.

[51] *Gallia christiana,* X, 1535, and Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 136, simply place Adalbert after Actard in the Thérouanne succession without an effort to date him. Van Werveke, *Het bisdom Terwaan,* p. 136, and Bled, *Regestes des évêques de Thérouanne,* I, 60, list Adalbert's episcopate as 872-887. Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 351 n., places its commencement in 871. That Adalbert's selection for Thérouanne did not take place until after the Holy See's authorization of the transfer of his predecessor may be taken for granted. That the selection took place prior to December, 872, may be deduced from Hincmar, *Epist.* XXVI (*PL* 126, 172A) : "quando confratres et coepiscopi nostri, Hodo et Rainelmus, Willebertus quoque et Adalbernus, atque Geroldus, et noviter ordinatus Hadelbertus, mecum Rhemi fuerunt . . .", wherein the prelates are those, respectively, of Beauvais, Noyon, Châlons, Thérouanne (for the identification of Adalbernus with Adalbert of Thérouanne, cf. Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* pp. 435, 553, nn. 461, 467), Amiens and Senlis. This *Epist.* XXVI cannot be as late as 879-882 as suggested by Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 560, n. 562, because Willebert of Châlons, here very much alive, died in January, 878. The reference to Hadebert of Senlis as *noviter ordinatus*—he was consecrated on December 12, 872; cf. note 56, below—both indicates that this letter belongs to early 873 and that Adalbert of Thérouanne and all the other bishops mentioned were Hadebert's seniors in consecration. *Adalbertus Morinensis ecclesiae episcopus* subscribes a document at Ponthion on June 30, 876 (*MGH, Capit.,* II, 349).

crated prior to December, 872. When, precisely, is unknown. Bishop Hilmerad was still Bishop of Amiens as late as August-September, 871, at which time the priest Gerold (his successor-to-be) represented him at the Council of Douzy. The seniority listing in Hincmar's *Epistola* XXVI indicates that while Gerold was senior to Hadebert, he was junior to Adalbert of Thérouanne in date of consecration, which means that Gerold's episcopal ordination fell sometime between February-December, 872.[52] We know nothing of Hincmar's role in the filling of the Amiens vacancy, but since both Gerold and Adalbert of Thérouanne were in familiar contact with their archbishop and their senior colleagues within a short period of their consecration (evidenced by Hincmar's *Epistola* XXVI) we have every reason for concluding that they were regarded as the canonical occupants of their sees.

The Archbishop of Rheims recounts how a delegation from the Diocese of Senlis visited him on June 7, 872, to announce the death of their bishop, Erpuin, the day before. Thus a sixteenth vacancy was opened in the Rheims provincial hierarchy. Seemingly within a matter of days Hincmar penned a letter to King Charles the Bald, informed him of the vacancy at Senlis, and requested that the king nominate one of the bishops of the province upon whom the archbishop might confer the requisite authority to function as visitor for a canonical election at Senlis.[53] Grounds do not exist for thinking that Hincmar found himself faced with royal interference; if anything, it is probable that he was urged to designate personally the new Bishop of Senlis for we hear of his having pointed out to a Count Boso that it was not his place as metropolitan to name a particular person for the vacancy.[54] When, at length, Hadebert was chosen for Senlis (by the canonical electors we may assume), the archbishop summoned his suffragans to take part in Hadebert's consecration.[55] A sacramentary, now at St. Genevieve's in Paris, dates this episcopal ordination as December 12, 872.[56]

---

[52] The last reference to Hilmerad of Amiens appears in the subscription: *Gerholdus presbyter ad vicem domni et patris mei Helmeradi Ambianensis ecclesiae episcopi* appended to the Council of Douzy, August-September, 871 (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 1653C). That the episcopal names in Hincmar's *Epist.* XXVI (cf. preceding note) follow a seniority listing is seen both in the epistle itself (Odo of Beauvais and Raginelm of Noyon are certainly the seniors of Willebert of Châlons, while Willebert is certainly senior to those names which follow his) as well as in the ordination document of March-April, 877, for Hedenulph of Laon (*PL* 126, 276C), where the same order (with the exception of Adalbert of Thérouanne, who was absent) occurs. Soyez, *Notices sur les évêques d'Amiens,* pp. 27, 28, places Hilmerad's death and Gerold's succession in 872. *Geroldus Ambianensis ecclesiae episcopus* was at Ponthion on June 30, 876 (*MGH, Capit.,* II, 349).

[53] *Epist.* XLVII, to Charles the Bald, June, 872 (*PL* 126, 267-68). It is the death of Erpuin which occurs on June 6 ("Erpoinum . . . octavo idus Junii defunctum audierim"). Both *Gallia christiana,* X, 1386, and Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 118, place this death in 871 which is impossible since the priest, Frothard, signs the acts of the Synod of Douzy, August-September, 871, *ad vicem domni et patris mei Erpoini Silvanectensis episcopi* (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 1653C). Hincmar testifies that Erpuin died on June 6; since he was alive at the

In August-September, 871, the Council of Douzy rendered a sentence of deposition against Hincmar, Bishop of Laon and nephew

---

time of Douzy, but had a successor by December, 872—cf. note 56—he must have died, as Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 576, n. 104, recognizes, in June, 872.

[54] Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis eccl.,* III, 26, to Count Boso (*MGH, SS,* XIII, 545): "de agenda electione Silvanectensis episcopi, ostendens, quod non sit sui ministerii quamcumque specialem designare personam." Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 543, n. 336, dates this letter, middle 872-873, but it must fall between June-December, 872. It is possible that Boso was a royal *missus* sent to Senlis to keep order during the election—cf. Pope John VIII, *Epist. to Hincmar,* January 5, 876 (*MGH, Epist.,* VII, 317)—who sought to hasten matters by asking the archbishop to designate the new bishop.

[55] Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis eccl.,* III, 23, to Bishop Hildebald of Soissons (*MGH, SS,* XIII, 532): "pro ordinatione Hadeberti ad episcopatum Silvanectensis ecclesiae." Hincmar's *Epist.* XXVI (*PL* 126, 172A) shows him to have received *noviter ordinatus Hadelbertus* at Rheims shortly after the consecration. This reception, the ordination summons and the probability that Hincmar examined the *decretum canonicum* (see *Epist.* XLVII; *PL* 126, 268B) suggest that Hadebert was canonically chosen for Senlis.

[56] The St. Genevieve sacramentary (BB 20, fol. 8) is thus cited by Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 118: "II id. decemb., regnante Karlomanno rege anno II fuere XI anni ordinationis Hadeberti episcopi indict. VI." Duchesne agrees with *Gallia christiana,* X, 1387 (which is in error in its transcription of the indiction) by interpreting the date as December 12, 871. He does not seem to be aware that both his calculation of the second regnal year (which he makes out to be 880) and the sixth indiction (873) flatly contradict his conclusion. The true date is December 12, 872. In the Senlis-Paris region, Carlomann II's regnal years were counted from the commencement of his sole rule (August 5, 882). The second year ran from August, 883 to August, 884: its December (883) marked the eleventh anniversary of Hadebert's consecration in 872. In turn, December 12, 872, fell within the sixth indiction wherever a September indiction was employed. For contemporary French use of the September indiction, cf. Charles the Bald's diploma of December 16, 854 (Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* I, 446) and the letter, dated November 2, 867, of the Council of Troyes (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 876A).

to the Archbishop of Rheims.[57] Pope Hadrian II declined to ratify the judgment until such time as the Laon prelate and someone to proffer charges against him might appear at the papal court.[58] It was not until early in 876, during the pontificate of John VIII (872-882), that the Holy See at last approved the deposition of the younger Hincmar and authorized an election at Laon to choose his successor.[59] Directly upon receipt of the pontifical decision, which reached Rheims on March 11, 876, the archbishop took steps to fill the Laon vacancy—the seventeenth in the province during his tenure. A document of March 28, 876, drawn up by the clergy and laity of Laon, testifies that on that date the priest, Hedenulph, was canonically elected to the vacant see.[60] But, obviously, something delayed Hedenulph's consecration since we find Hincmar writing twice to Emperor Charles the Bald on behalf of the Laon see as yet without a bishop.[61] Possibly additional papal directives were required before the obstacles were surmounted; at all events, the archbishop was finally enabled to summon Bishop Odo of Beauvais (and, no doubt, his other suffragans as well) to

---

[57] Conc. Douzy, cap. 10 (Labbe-Cossart, VIII, 1652), also, *Epist. of the Conc. Douzy to Pope Hadrian II,* September 6, 871 (*ibid.,* 1654D), Hincmar of Rheims, *Epist. to Pope Hadrian,* September, 871 (*PL* 126, 642B), *Annales Bertiniani,* 871 (ed. Waitz, pp. 116-117).

[58] Pope Hadrian II, *Epist.* 34, December 26, 871 (*MGH, Epist.,* VI, 739-40); cf. Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* pp. 344 ff.

[59] Pope John VIII, *Epist. to Hincmar of Rheims,* January 5, 876 (*MGH, Epist.,* VII, 317): "Noli ergo iam nunc ecclesiam Laudunensem viduatam et sine regimine pastorali dimittere, sed indifferenter electum et de Laudunensis ecclesiae clero virum idoneum et in quo omnium vota consentiant, eidem ecclesiae praefice prorsus episcopum." A chancery notation indicates that the letter was received at Rheims on March 11, 876.

[60] Edited as Hincmar's *Epist.* LI (*PL* 126, 270) and commonly taken for the *decretum canonicum* of the Laon election of March 28, 876. However, M. Andrieu, "Le sacre épiscopal d'après Hincmar de Reims," in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* 48 (1953), 26 n., has suggested that this is actually a *petitio supplex* made out by the Laon electors as a covering letter for their *decretum.*

[61] Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis eccl.,* III, 18, to Emp. Charles (*MGH, SS,* XIII, 510): "pro causa Laudunensium et ordinando eis pontifice post deiectionem Hincmari. Item de eadem re." There is no reason to suppose that these letters antedate the receipt of the papal authorization (March 11, 876) for the Laon election; since there is hardly time for *two* letters between that receipt and the election (March 28, 876), they may safely be assigned to the period between the election and Hedenulph's consecration in March-April 877. Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 548, nn. 403-404, dates them 876-877.

Hedenulph's episcopal ordination.[62] On a day falling between March 16 and April 1, 877, Hedenulph was raised to the episcopate by Hincmar and provided with an ordination document bearing the archbishop's signature and those of seven Rheims suffragans.[63]

The death of Bishop Willebert on January 10, 878, left the Diocese of Châlons-sur-Marne without a shepherd, though by May 26, 878, a new prelate, Berno, was already installed in the see.[64] We really know nothing of how Berno was selected for Châlons, but his association with Pope John VIII, Archbishop Hincmar, and other prelates at the Council of Troyes, August-September, 878, argues to his full acceptance by the hierarchy within months of his consecration.[65] That he had been canonically elected to Châlons would seem implied in the fact that the following year—879—he was employed by the archbishop in the endeavor to arrange a canonical election at Noyon.[66]

---

[62] Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis eccl.*, III, 23, to Odo of Beauvais (*MGH, SS*, XIII, 530-531): "pro ordinatione Hedenulfi secundum iussionem Iohannis papae ad episcopatum Laudunensem diu pastore vacantem." Flodoard, III, 21 (*ibid.*, 515) notes Hincmar's having written, "de ordinatione quoque Hedenulfi in episcopatu Laudunensi et confirmatione papae ipsius ordinationis." The *Annales Bertiniani*, 878 (ed. Waitz, p. 144) describe Hedenulph as "sua (Pope John's) auctoritate ordinatus episcopus." All of which suggests something more than the papal letter to Hincmar of January 5, 876. Between March, 876, and April, 877, there is not extant any papal epistle confirming Hedenulph's election and commanding his consecration, but instructions may have been given orally to the two Bishops Peter sent as John VIII's legates to the Emperor Charles the Bald on February 10, 877 (Jaffe-Wattenbach, *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, I, 3077).

[63] The ordination document appears as Hincmar's *Epist.* LII (*PL* 126, 271-276) and is dated: "anno incarnationis dominicae 877, anno autem regni domni Caroli imperatoris XXXVII, et anno imperii ejus II." The imperial year places the document subsequent to December 25, 876, the regnal year, prior to June 19, 877. If the Incarnational style is used properly (which is probably not the case), it is subsequent to March 25, 877. A closer dating of the consecration is supplied by the *Annales s. Maximini Trevensis* (*MGH, SS*, II, 213): "anno 877 . . . kalendas Aprilis ordinatio Hedenulfi episcopi." Because there is a lacuna in the mss before *kalendas*, the date may be as early as March 16 (XVII kal. Apr.) or as late as April 1 (kal. Apr.). Hedenulph appears as Bishop of Laon at Ponthion on June 30, 876 (*MGH, Capit.*, II, 349). He may have participated in virtue of his being bishop-elect, or his signature may have been added later. Hedenulph's resignation of his see was refused by Pope John VIII at the Synod of Troyes in September, 878 (Labbe-Cossart, IX, 320AB).

[64] A Châlons necrology which places Willebert's death on "iv id. Jan." (Jan. 10) is adduced by *Gallia christiana*, IX, 868. Apparently because he misread this as "iv non. Jan.", Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux*, III, 98, works out the death-date as January 2, 878. Schrörs, *Hinkmar*, p. 576, n. 102, rightly gives January 10, 878, in opposition to É. de Barthélemy, *Diocèse ancien de Châlons-sur-Marne*, I, 342, who assigns Willebert's death, as well as the accession of Bishop Berno, to 877. That the January 10 obit belongs to 878 is evident from the fact that the last mention of Willebert occurs in March 16-April 1, 877, in the consecration document for Hedenulph of Laon (*PL* 126, 276C), while by May 26, 878, Berno appears as Bishop of Châlons in a property exchange ("Cartulaire de Saint-Étienne de Châlons," in *Mémoires de la société d'agriculture* [Châlons], année 1895, pp. 169-170).

An episcopal vacancy—the nineteenth during Hincmar's tenure—occurred at Cambrai with the death of Bishop John on August 15. Schrörs has noted both month and day, but, observing that the year must fall between 877 and 879, has himself opted for 877.[67] Unfortunately, he has overlooked a monastic *privilegium* of Pope John VIII, issued at the Synod of Troyes on August 18, 878, which was subscribed (whether immediately or only subsequently is not known) by Bishop John of Cambrai. John was, therefore, among the living at least as late as the date of the document. It follows that if he died on August 15, it could not have been before 879.[68] The steps taken by the Archbishop of Rheims to provide a canonical successor to John are still documented in his commissioning Bishop Hedenulph of Laon to act as episcopal visitor for an election at Cambrai, as well as in his instructions to the diocesan electors at Cambrai concerning the proper method of choosing their prelate.[69] Apparently such a canonical choice was made in the person of Rotrad (whose name also appears as Rothad and Roderard) who continued at Cambrai until his death some years after Hincmar's own decease.[70]

---

[65] Berno's signature is joined with that of the pope and those of the archbishop and other prelates who subscribe the Synod of Troyes (Labbe-Cossart, IX, 313). His name also appears upon a *privilegium* for the monastery of Tournus issued at the Council of Châlon-sur-Saône in 875 (*ibid.*, 276), but it must have been added at a later date.

[66] Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis eccl.*, III, 23 (*MGH, SS,* XIII, 533), cf. notes 74, 75, below.

[67] Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* 585, n. 153.

[68] Pope John VIII's *privilegium* for the monastery of St. Giles ("Notum sit omnibus," *PL* 126, 792-795) is dated August 18, 878, and bears the signature of *Joannes Cameracensis episcopus.* Jaffe-Wattenbach, *Regesta,* I, n. 3179, accept it as genuine, as does Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 114. Warichez, "Les fastes épiscopaux de Cambrai," in *Collationes dioecesis Tornacensis,* 21 (1925-1926), 296, dates John's death as August 15, 879; apparently it is due to a misprint that H. Lancelin, *Histoire du diocèse de Cambrai* (Valenciennes, 1946), 65, places it ten days earlier.

[69] Hincmar, *Epists.* XLVIII, and L (*PL* 126, 268-269, 269-270). Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 549, nn. 415, 416, dates both letters: August-November, though he proposes 877 rather than the actual 879.

Termini for the selection of a Bishop of Noyon-Tournai are supplied by the death of Bishop Raginelm during the closing months of 879, and the fact that when King Louis of Saxony came to France at the beginning of 880, Hetilo already occupied the See of Noyon.[71] A chronology of the intervening period can be constructed from Hincmar's twelve letters summarized in Flodoard's *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* (III, 19; 23; 24), and catalogued individually by Heinrich Schrörs in the *Register* which serves as appendix to his *Hinkmar, Erzbischof von Reims.*[72] Schrörs' arrangement of the twelve letters has been accepted without question by G. Ehrenforth.[73] But there are certain difficulties in Schrörs' reconstruction. For one thing, the letter which he places at the head of the series (*Register* 461) belongs to the same situation as *Register* 465, 466, and would seem to presuppose the royal refusal of canonical election which is noted at the commencement of *Register* 468. It may, therefore, plausibly be proposed that the following arrangement, differing from that of Schrörs, better reflects the actual course of events.

---

[70] *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium,* I, 60 (*MGH, SS,* VII, 422): "Sancto vero Iohanni in episcopium Rotradus successit." The regularity of Rotrad's election may be assumed if Hincmar did in fact actualize his intention of examining both the elect and the *decretum* (see *Epist.* XLVIII; *PL* 126, 269A). *Annales Vedastini,* A.D. 887 (*MGH, SS,* II, 203): "Hroderardus, Camaracensium episcopus, his diebus obiit." Warichez, "Les fastes épiscopaux de Cambrai," in *op. cit.,* 296, dates Rotrad's decease as October 14, 886. For the little known about Rotrad, cf. R. Parisot, *Le royaume de Lorraine sous les carolingiens* (Paris, 1899), 418 n., 489 n.

[71] *Annales Vedastini,* A.D. 879 (*MGH, SS,* II, 197): "Ragnelmus Tornacensium episcopus, moritur indictione XIII." Only the months of 879 subsequent to September correspond to the thirteenth indiction. Raginelm last appears in Pope John VIII's *privilegium* of August 18, 878 (*PL* 126, 795A). The Saxon Louis' visit to France in early 880 is described in *Annales Bertiniani,* A.D. 880 (ed. Waitz, p. 150). That Hetilo was already bishop at this time is clear from Hincmar's letter to him, digested in Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis eccl.,* III, 23 (*MGH, SS,* XIII, 534): "quia Ludowicus rex Germaniae mandaverat illi, ut iret ei obviam, quod tamen acturus non esset in cippo infirmitatis detentus, mandans huic episcopo, ut . . . insistat pro pace . . ." J. Warichez, *Les origines de l'église de Tournai,* pp. 79-80, and "Les fastes épiscopaux de Tournai," in *Collationes dioecesis Tornacensis,* 21 (1925-6), 202, rightly assigns Raginelm's death to late 879 and Hetilo's consecration to 880.

[72] Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* pp. 553, 554, catalogued as *Register,* nn. 461-468, 478-481, and dated: end of 879, for *Reg.* 461-468; end of 879-beginning of 880, for *Reg.* 478-481. If we knew the death-date of Hincmar of Laon, *Reg.* 464 could be dated more exactly. For the narrative of the Noyon election, cf. Schrörs, *op. cit.,* 435-436.

[73] G. Ehrenforth, "Hinkmar von Rheims und Ludwig III von Westfranken," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* 44 (1925), 67. The account in G. Weise, *Königtum und Bischofswahl im fränkischen und deutschen Reich* (Göttingen, 1912), pp. 53-54, is too brief to provide an independent judgment.

The death of Bishop Raginelm of Noyon, occurring sometime between September-December, 879, was communicated officially to the Archbishop of Rheims by a delegation from the bereaved diocese. Hincmar wrote at once to Kings Louis III (879-882) and Carlomann (879-884), sons and successors of Louis the Stammerer (who had died on April 10, 879), and petitioned a canonical election for Noyon. At the same time, he requested his suffragan, Bishop Berno of Châlons, to accompany the Noyon delegates to the royal court and there to present the monarchs with Hincmar's letter on behalf of a free election. Berno was asked to use his good offices with the kings as well as with certain officials toward the securing of royal consent to such an election. A letter was also dispatched by the archbishop to the influential Abbot Hugh of Tours seeking his intervention in favor of a proper election.[74]

Louis III and Carlomann at first put the interim management of the vacant diocese (*pro custodienda Tornacensi parrochia*) in Hincmar's hands. But somewhat later (Ehrenforth proposes the winter of 879, but it may well have been prior to December), the monarchs indicated that they would not consent to a free election, whereupon the archbishop penned a strong protest and at the same time took a step which he was later to defend, in a letter to Abbot Hugh, as something consistent with his practice during the thirty-five years of his episcopate. It may be suggested that this step was nothing other than Hincmar's naming, on his own authority, Bishop Adalbert of Thérouanne to act as canonical visitor to Noyon with the mandate of assemblying clergy and laity of the diocese for a valid election. Concurrently, the archbishop wrote again to Bishop Berno of Châlons, informing him that Adalbert had been given the regular *forma electionis* and that the Noyon electorate had been instructed—by an archiepiscopal letter—in the mechanism of a canonical election. Berno was asked to seek from the sovereigns and from Abbot Hugh swift action in approving the choice of Bishop Adalbert as visitor, which request Hincmar repeated in a subsequent letter.[75]

---

[74] Schrörs, *Register* n. 462 (Flodoard, *MGH, SS,* XIII, 510): "ad filios quoque ipsius regis defuncti, Ludowicum et Karlomannum, pro electione canonica ecclesiae Tornacensi vel Noviomensi obtinenda post obitum Ragenelini episcopi." *Reg.* n. 463 (*ibid.,* 533): "Bernoni Catalaunensi pro Noviomagensis ecclesiae missis, qui ad se post obitum Rainelini episcopi sui venerant, ut eos idem Berno ad presentiam regum perducat et eisdem regibus litteras huius domni Hincmari relegat et intelligere faciat et pro hac causa tam apud reges quam apud palatinos secundum ministerium suum intercedere satagat." *Reg.* n. 464 (*ibid.,* 537): "Hugoni abbati pro electione Noviomensis episcopi post decessum Ragenelini petens, ut hortetur reges Ludowicum et Karlomannum quatinus voluntatem Dei et antecessorum suorum consuetudinem in hac causa conservent."

The monarchs' response was forwarded to the archbishop by Abbot Hugh through a cleric named Warin. Its nature can only be reconstructed from the subsequent letters of Hincmar which indicate that in several missives the kings complained that the Archbishop of Rheims was striving to install his own candidate at Noyon. For their part, they insisted that the vacant see be given one of the palace clergy. In reply, the archbishop stoutly denied that he had any nominee of his own in mind and expounded for Abbot Hugh the canons governing valid election. Knowing now the royal intention to foist its own creature upon Noyon, Hincmar wrote to Bishop Adalbert, informed him of developments and asked him to come to Rheims whereat a course of action might be charted before Adalbert went to court in the attempt to gain assent to a free and canonical election.[76]

---

[75] Schrörs, *Register* n. 468a (Flodoard, *MGH, SS,* XIII, 537): "Hugoni abbati . . . de his quae sibi idem reges pro custodienda Tornacensi parrochia mandaverant, et quid ipse super his egerat, quidve illi postea remandaverint, vel quid ipse rescripserit eis nolentibus assensum prebere super electione canonica prefatae Noviomensis ecclesiae; et quia ipse nihil inde aliud egerat, nisi quod per triginta et quinque annos in huiusmodi negocio solitus erat." *Reg.* n. 461 (*ibid.,* 533): "Adalberno pro visitatione prefatae Tornacensis ecclesiae, ut eidem suam visitationem sollerter impendat et frequenter electionis formam clero plebique relegat et inculcat, ne per ignorantiam ab eadem forma in aliquo devient." *Reg.* nn. 465, 466 (*ibid.,* 533): "Bernoni Catalaunensi . . . pro electione pastoris premissae Noviomagensis vel Tornacensis ecclesiae, et quia formam visitationis vel electionis Adalberno episcopo et eidem ecclesiae transmiserit; monens, ut petat reges et Hugonem abbatem ut quantocius sibi litterae a regibus super hac causa mittantur, quia ipsa ecclesia sine detrimento diu vacare pastore non poterat. Item, pro eadem re et aliis quibusdam." The Adalbern of the texts is properly identified by Schrörs with Bishop Adalbert of Thérouanne. On the *forma electionis,* cf. Beck in *Catholic Historical Review,* XLIII (July, 1957), 145.

[76] Schrörs, *Register* n. 468b (Flodoard, *MGH, SS,* XIII, 537): ". . . et quid sibi (Hincmar) mandatum postea ex parte regum vel ipsius Hugonis in hac causa per Warinum clericum fuerit, quasque litteras deinde prefati reges eidem

If Adalbert's audience with the kings did take place, nothing was gained, for when next we pick up the thread of events, the monarchs are complaining bitterly that an election has been held under the authorization of the archbishop. Twice, Hincmar replied in defense of his action, suggesting, on the latter occasion, that the crown bother to learn the canon law involved. Somewhat later, the archbishop was again in communication with the kings to warn them how evil it was for them to postpone their consent to the consecration of the elect of Noyon.[77]

It was not long thereafter that Hincmar invited his suffragans to participate in the consecration of Hetilo, whom the faithful of Noyon had elected as their shepherd. Whether royal consent to the election and consecration was obtained or dispensed with, we do not know. At all events, by the beginning of 880, Hetilo was already Bishop of Noyon and secure enough in his see to be employed in negotiations with the *primores regni.*[78]

Just as the Noyon vacancy of 879-880 led to conflict between the crown and the Archbishop of Rheims, so, too, did the vacancy at

---

miserint, adiungens sacrorum canonum promulgatas super electione canonica auctoritates, et ostendens quod non episcopi de palatio precipiantur elegi, sed de propria qualibet ecclesia, et quod de ordinando episcopo non regis vel palatinorum debet esse commendatio, sed cleri et plebis electio et metropolitani in electione diiudicatio, deinde terreni principis consensio, et sic fieri episcoporum manus impositio; asserens pro certo, quod ipse in neminem specialiter intenderet . . ." *Reg.* n. 467 (*ibid.,* 533), to Adalbert: "pro electione pastoris ipsius ecclesiae, quia multi laborarent, ut non per ostium intrarent, non timentes neque verecundantes fures fieri et latrones, et quia mandandus sit ad presentiam regum, quo cum perrexerit, loquatur secum, ut, qualiter hinc de cetero sibi sit agendum, simul considerent."

[77] Schrörs, *Register* nn. 478-480 (Flodoard, *MGH, SS,* XIII, 510), to Kings Louis III and Cariomann: "pro ipsa electione iam facta, quam indigne tulerant ab ipso archiepiscopo fuisse dispositam. Item, pro eadem re, ostendens . . . quale sit ministerium regale, et quale pontificale, et qualis eligendus vel ordinandus sit episcopus, et qualis vel qualiter non debeat ordinari, et ut divinas auctoritates addiscere curent. Item, pro eadem re, sacris demonstrans auctoritatibus, quam graviter in Deum peccarent, qui ordinationem illam tamdiu differi facerent."

[78] Schrörs, *Register* n. 481 (Flodoard, *MGH, SS,* XIII, 531), to Bishop Odo of Beauvais: "pro ordinatione Hetilonis quem plebs Noviomagensis episcopum sibi elegerat ordinandum." Hincmar's instructions to the clergy and new Bishop of Noyon, assigned by Schrörs, *Reg.* n. 482, to late 879, may just as well belong to 860. For the evidence that Hetilo was already a bishop in early 880, cf. note 71, above.

Beauvais which was to prove the twenty-first and final vacancy during Hincmar's tenure. In this case, the period involved ran from January 28, 881 (as seems more probable), to sometime between May and August, 882.[79]

There was little reason for thinking, right after the decease of Bishop Odo of Beauvais (January 28, 881), that the vacant see would long continue without a shepherd. Perhaps as early as February, King Louis III (879-882) had given consent to a canonical election, which made it possible for Hincmar to instruct the electors of Beauvais (*Epistola* XXXIX) concerning the proper procedure for choosing a bishop. At the same time, the prelate set the electoral machinery in motion by commissioning Bishop Hadebert of Senlis, whom the king had approved, to act as canonical visitor for the election.[80]

The election did take place, either in February or March, 881, but its outcome opened a series of complications. A Rudolph who had been put forward was rejected, then, an Honoratus, chosen by the diocese with the full formality of a *decretum canonicum,* was disapproved by the Archbishop of Rheims and his fellow bishops assembled at the Synod of Fismes on April 2, 881, on the grounds of insufficient learning.[81]

Along with their disqualifying Honoratus the prelates at Fismes notified the Diocese of Beauvais that its unworthy choice had forfeited for it the electoral franchise, which now devolved upon the hierarchy. The synod also wrote to King Louis III, praying him to authorize the bishops neighboring upon Beauvais to select a suitable ordinary for the vacant see.[82]

---

[79] Hincmar's summons to Bishop Odo of Beauvais to attend the consecration of Hetilo of Noyon—cf. the preceding note—indicates that Odo was still alive at the turn of 879-880. Both *Gallia christiana,* IX, 700, and Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 121, assign Odo's death without question to January 28, 881. Delettre, *Histoire du diocèse de Beauvais,* I, 370, quotes the cathedral obituary which dates Odo's decease as February 11, a date judged erroneous by P. Grierson, "Eudes I^{er}, évêque de Beauvais," in *Le Moyen Age,* 45 (1935), 192, who himself supports January 28, 881. Though Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* pp. 436, 574, n. 93, also accepts the January 28 obit, he is not prepared to dismiss entirely the possibility of February 11. For the election and consecration of Bishop Hrotgar between May-August, 882, cf. notes 86, 87, below.

[80] *Epist.* XXXIX, to the electors (*PL* 126, 258-261), speaks of "electione canonica a domino nostro rege vobis solita benignitate concessa," while *Epist.* XLIX, to Hadebert (*ibid.,* 269), mentions Hadebert's "officio visitatoris, consensu domini nostri Ludovici regis . . . metropolitana delegatione suscepto." Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 556, nn. 500, 501, rightly dates both documents in February 881.

[81] *Epist.* XIX, June, 881 (*PL* 126, 114CD): ". . . qui commorantur in Belvacensi ecclesia . . . cupiditate caecati . .. et reprobato Rodulfo, et a se electo Honorato sacro episcopali ordini adhuc fidei doctrina incongruo, perdiderunt

Unfortunately, Louis III was not in the mood to honor this synodal request. He did communicate with Hincmar in a letter delivered by the cleric Teutbert which was in the archbishop's hands by May 6, 881, wherein he professed his royal readiness to follow the prelate's advice, but he also called attention to the fact that in the meantime the electorate of Beauvais had unanimously chosen one Odacre as their bishop. The letter obviously was designed to inform Hincmar that Louis wanted Odacre to have the bishopric.[83]

---

electionem, sicut ostensum est illis in synodo"; (*ibid.,* 110A): "episcopi qui apud martyrium sanctae Macrae . . . convenimus . . . relecta praesumptione cleri et plebis ecclesiae Belvacensis, qui personam regulis sacris incongruam, cum decreto singulorum manibus roborato, nobis praesentaverunt in synodo . . ." The formal election of Honoratus by the diocesan electors is certain. Whether Rudolph was rejected at Beauvais by the electors or later by the bishops sitting in judgment upon Beauvais' election is not stated. Both *Gallia christiana,* IX, 700, and Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 121, suggest that Rudolph was Hincmar's candidate rejected by the diocesan electors. K. Weinzierl, "Erzbischof Hinkmar von Reims als Verfechter des geltenden Rechts," in *Episcopus, Studien über das Bischofsamt* (Regensburg, 1949), p. 146, and Delettre, *Histoire du diocèse de Beauvais,* I, 372-373, think of both Rudolph and Honoratus as Beauvais' candidates rejected by Hincmar. It is certain, indeed, that Honoratus' unsuitability excludes his having been Hincmar's suggestion. Since there is no indication in *Epist.* XIX that Rudolph had had a *decretum* drawn in his favor, it would appear that his rejection was the work of the Beauvais electors. Since at Senlis in 872 and at Noyon in 879 Hincmar had purposely avoided indicating his own choice for the vacant see—cf. notes 54, 76, above—it may seriously be questioned whether he would here have expressed favor for Rudolph. Probability supports the view that Rudolph was nominated locally but was passed over by the Beauvais electorate in favor of the unsuitable Honoratus.

[82] A fragment of this petition of April, 881, to Louis III is incorporated into Hincmar's *Epist.* XIX, June, 881 (*PL* 126, 110BC). It requested that the new prelate be chosen by the bishops of the Rheims province, approved by the clergy and laity of Beauvais, and consecrated by the metropolitan and suffragans of Rheims after having received the diocesan temporalities from the crown.

[83] What is known of Louis' letter delivered on May 6 is derived from Hincmar's *Epist.* XIX, June 1-13, 881 (*PL* 126, espec. 114BD, 115D). The election of Odacre is thus mentioned: "Quod scripsistis, vota omnium qui commorantur in Belvacensi ecclesia in Odacrum concordare . . ."; that it was uncanonical appears from: "nunc contra regulas et leges sine visitatore presumpserunt electionem." The election must have occurred between April 2-May 6, 881. There

Hincmar's response, composed between June 1-13, 881, counselled the monarch not to proceed with the investiture of Odacre and renewed the request that royal permission be extended the bishops of the province, in union with clergy and faithful of Beauvais, to choose a prelate for the vacant see. There was the reminder, too, that if Louis did bestow the diocesan temporalities upon his candidate, the archbishop would see to it that Odacre be permanently barred from ecclesiastical office in the Rheims province.[84] But in the meanwhile, the king had acted. From his letter, delivered to Hincmar by the cleric Warin on June 13, it is clear that he had already invested Odacre with the temporalities of Beauvais, though only after last minute attempts to wheedle the archbishop's consent or to threaten him if he refused. Both efforts brought disdain from the Metropolitan of Rheims whose measured reply, penned between June 13-30, showed that he was contemplating action, synodal or otherwise, to brand Odacre as an usurper and to prohibit his holding of ecclesiastical dignities until such time as he submitted to his archbishop.[85]

Many months ran by before the archiepiscopal action became fact. The delay may well have been due to an understandable unwillingness to come into conflict with Louis III at a time wherin, as the *Annales Bertiniani* record, he was troubled by Viking invasion of his frontier. But in the end, sometime between April and June, 882, Hincmar and

---

is no evidence that Hincmar was antipathetic to Odacre; his resentment arose from the royal pressure: "Quod scripsistis, ut per meam voluntatem et ministerium Belvacensis ecclesiae episcopatum dilecto filio meo et fideli vestro Odacro tribuere valeatis, si vestrae dominationi de illo est cura, hoc nullatenus faciatis . . ."

[84] *Epist.* XIX, June 1-13, 881 (*PL* 126, 110-117). The threat of action against Odacre is phrased: "nec in vita mea, nec post mortem corporis mei, in dioecesi Rhemensi in gradu ecclesiastico valeat ministrare" (115D-116A). The request for the new election takes the form: "conveniant ergo . . . in synodo episcopi et clerus ac plebs Belvacensis ecclesiae cum libero consensu vestro (Louis III) . . . et juxta legalem ac regularem formam electio exsequatur et ordinatio prosequatur" (117C), which is a modification of the proposal made at Fismes in April. The date of the letter is determined by mention of "transacti mensis Maii" (114B) and the absence of any reference to a royal letter which reached Hincmar on June 13 (*Epist.* XX, *ibid.*, 117D).

[85] *Epist.* XX, June 13-30, 881 (*PL* 126, 117-122); the date is established by the mention of the ides "praesentis Junii mensis" (117D). Mention is made of Louis' attempts to win Hincmar's consent (118AB,D), of his threats (119A, 120C), of the investiture of Odacre (119D), of the projected penalties against the usurper (121C).

his suffragans gathered in synod to excommunicate Odacre and to warn his supporters ("ex quocunque statu vel quocunque ordine," thus including the crown) that henceforth they contract the guilt of schism.[86]

The synodal censure proved effective. Louis III withdrew his support from Odacre, confessed his fault, did penance, and received absolution from the bishops. At Beauvais the usurper soon retired since before Louis III's death (August 5, 882) a new bishop had already been consecrated who "coram omnibus et electoribus (which indicates his canonical election) et ordinatoribus suis" had signed an ordination document pledging his observance of the canons.[87] Hincmar does not identify this new prelate of Beauvais, though it is true that he regards him as properly elected and approved by the provincial episcopate. From the *Annales Vedastini* it appears that his name was Hrotgar and that he outlived his archbishop (who died on December 21, 882), passing away himself in 883.[88]

---

[86] The excommunication is promulgated in *Epist.* XXXIII (*PL* 126, 245-253), which describes Odacre's usurpation as "plus quam annum" (246A). The synod cannot be earlier than April 4, 882, since there is mention of "proxime praecedenti coenae Dominicae die" (246B). If the usurpation is counted from the time of Odacre's uncanonical election at Beauvais, the excommunicating synod could have assembled as early as the middle of April, 882; if it is reckoned from Louis III's investiture of Odacre, the synod cannot be earlier than June, 882. Ehrenforth, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* 44 (1925), 69, suggests the end of May for the excommunication. Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 439 n., proposes July, 882, which leaves too little time for the liquidation of the entire affair before Louis III's death on August 5, 882.

[87] Cf. Hincmar's treatise, *Quae exsequi debeat episcopus* (*PL* 125, 1087-94), which Schrörs, *Hinkmar,* p. 439 n., assigns to July, 882. Louis III's penance and reconciliation are recorded (1092C), as well as the pledge of the "episcopo . . . nuper ordinato" (1093A). Ehrenforth, *ZKG,* 44 (1925), 69, correctly places Louis' penance after Odacre's excommunication; he suggests May-June, 882, for the capitulation of the king and the election-consecration of the new bishop. It is certain that Hrotgar was consecrated prior to August 5, 882, probable that he was examined by the archbishop prior to his approval by the hierarchy (cf. *Epist.* XLIX; *PL* 126, 269B).

[88] *Annales Vedastini,* A.D. 883 (*MGH, SS,* II, 200): "moritur etiam his diebus Hrotgarius, Belvagorum episcopus, cui successit Honoratus." The name, *Otgarius Belvagorum episcopus* appears upon a Corbie diploma dated March 16, 877 (Levillain, *Examen critique des chartes . . . de l'abbaye de Corbie,* 290). Though this is a tenth-century fabrication, the episcopal names may have been copied accurately from authentic sources. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* III, 122 n., is of the opinion that Hincmar refused to consecrate Hrotgar. This interpretation is contradicted by Hincmar's own *Quae exsequi debeat episcopus.*

In the light of this record Hincmar must be judged to have shown throughout his episcopate a commendable concern for canonical election to the suffragan bishoprics within his own Province of Rheims. Of the twenty-one vacancies occurring in the dioceses subject to him, we have evidence that in thirteen instances the archbishop endeavored to secure for the diocese a canonical election, though it may be that what he sought at Thérouanne in 870 was local consent to the transfer of a bishop rather than a true election. In the remaining eight cases, viz., Laon in 847 and 858, Beauvais in 859-860, Noyon in 860, Soissons in 862, Thérouanne and Amiens in 872, Châlons in 878, we are without proof of Hincmar's exertions in favor of regular elections. In two of these eight cases, however, we are otherwise certain that proper elections were held (i.e., at Laon in 858 and at Beauvais in 859-860), though in a third (Soissons, 862) it is possible that selection by the hierarchy may have been substituted for a local plebiscite.

To put the record differently, of the twenty-one episcopal vacancies, five (Laon in 847, Noyon in 860, Thérouanne and Amiens in 872, and Châlons in 878) are known to us so scantily that we can neither prove nor disprove a canonical election, though, on the whole, in each case such an election is probable. Two other situations (Soissons in 862 and Thérouanne in 870) were sufficiently special in character to have seen (possibly in the first instance, probably in the second) a dispensing with popular election, though even here we cannot assert categorically that diocesan participation in the choice of its bishop was excluded. In seven cases in all whereof we know the archbishop's efforts for canonical elections, we cannot really say whether he was successful or not in two (Thérouanne, 856, and Châlons, possibly 856 or 857); but in the remaining five instances (Beauvais in 845-846, Amiens in 849, Soissons in 869-870, Senlis in 872, and Cambrai in 879) probability favors the interpretation that a proper election was, in fact, obtained. There are seven vacancies of which we can assert with certitude that they terminated in free, canonical elections, viz., Laon in 858, Beauvais in 859-860, Cambrai in 862-866, Châlons in 868, Laon in 876, Noyon in 879-880, and Beauvais in 881-882. We have seen that at Châlons in 868, Hincmar had to do with a royal nominee. It is a tribute to him that he insisted upon, and obtained, popular election of the royal candidate before he extended his recognition. Even more indicative of the archbishop's insistence upon legal procedures is what we know of events at Cambrai, 862-866, and at Beauvais, 881-882, where canonical elections, brought about by Hincmar, finally succeeded in replacing with regularly elected bishops usurpers who enjoyed the support of the crown. Noyon, too, in 879-880, stands as a monument to the success of the Archbishop of Rheims in bringing off a true election in the face of a flat royal refusal to permit the plebiscite.

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington

LIBERALISM AND THE MEXICAN CRISIS OF 1927: A DEBATE BETWEEN NORMAN THOMAS AND JOHN A. RYAN

EDITED BY

FRANCIS L. BRODERICK*

The controversy between the Mexican government and the Catholic Church in Mexico, which entered an active phase in 1926, had boisterous echoes in the United States. American Catholics generally sided with their co-religionists below the border, while many American liberals, impressed by the social and economic reforms since 1917, sided with the government. The American Department of State, pulled in one direction by Catholics and by oil interests which had felt the impact of Mexican economic reforms and in the other direction by liberal opinion and by a strengthened policy of non-intervention in Latin America, tried manfully to mediate the dispute without committing itself publicly.[1]

At the heart of the difficulty were those parts of the Mexican constitution of 1917 which imposed restrictions on the Church, especially Articles 3,5,27, and 130. For nine years the provisions were relatively unenforced. Then in June, 1926, President Plutarco Elías Calles announced a penal code, to become effective August 1, which provided penalties for violations of the religious laws of the nation. Whether this was an overt act of aggression against the Church, or a response to an overt act by the Mexican bishops, is still a matter of debate.[2] In either case it opened hostilities between the government and the Church. This was religious persecution, or defense of the state against clerical interference, depending on the point of view of the speaker.

---

* Mr. Broderick is instructor in history at Phillips Exeter Academy and author of *W. E. B. Du Bois, Negro Leader in a Time of Crisis* (Stanford, 1959). He is at present writing a biography of Monsignor John A. Ryan.

[1] The fullest discussion of the diplomacy involved is Sister M. Elizabeth Ann Rice, O.P., *The Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Mexico, as Affected by the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Mexico, 1925-1929* (Washington, 1959). Cf. also L. Ethan Ellis, "Dwight Morrow and the Church-State Controversy in Mexico," *Hispanic American Historical Review,* XXXVIII (November, 1958), 482-505. For the liberal viewpoint cf. Ernest Gruening, *Mexico and Its Heritage* (New York, 1928).

[2] Rice, *op. cit.,* pp. 62-68.

In the United States Father John A. Ryan, and the American hierarchy speaking through the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference,[3] quickly sided with the Mexican Church. Professor of moral theology in the Catholic University of America and director of the Social Action Department of the NCWC, Father Ryan was noted for his liberal political and economic ideas. In the 1920's he had been active in defending civil liberties, in working for the child labor amendment, in joining liberal groups committed to a dozen progressive causes. Sympathetic to the economic reforms of the Mexican government, he still regarded its attack on the Church as a blow to freedom, and he condemned it on liberal grounds—the right to freedom of religion for Mexican Catholics—as much as on religious grounds.

In this view he received less support from American liberals than he expected. The liberals failed to condemn Calles' invasion of religious liberty because they were unwilling to impede economic reform in Mexico, he said, just as many American Catholics failed to condemn Benito Mussolini's assaults on Italian civil liberties because they approved of other items in his program. Consistent, Ryan condemned both. He called upon liberals to do the same.[4] In an article for the *N.C.W.C. Bulletin,* he complained that the American liberal, silent on the Mexican persecution, "denies in effect that civic and religious rights and freedoms are matters of universal principle; apparently, they are merely matters of policy." Specifically he complained that Norman Thomas, the prominent American Socialist who was executive director of the League for Industrial Democracy, disposed of the anti-religious persecutions in two sentences: "We cannot judge the unhappy church conflicts in Mexico by American standards or American conditions. The long record of clerical opposition in Mexico to religious, political and economic freedom makes that impossible."[5] Father Ryan sent a copy of this latter article to Mr. Thomas. This triggered a debate between the two men.[6]

Phillips Exeter Academy

[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 79-81.

[4] John A. Ryan, "American Liberals and Mexican Tyranny," *N.C.W.C. Bulletin,* VIII (August, 1926), iii, 13-14.

[5] Ryan, "American Liberals and Mexican Tyranny," *ibid.,* VIII (February 1927), ix, 11. Note that despite the identical titles, this is a different article from the one cited in footnote 4.

[6] I am grateful to Monsignor Lawrence F. Ryan, brother of the late John A. Ryan, and to Mr. Norman Thomas for permission to reprint this corre-

February 10, 1927.

My dear Dr. Ryan:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your article on "American Liberals and Mexican Tyranny."[7] Your reference to me in the last paragraph prompts me to make several comments on the situation.

1. If all Roman Catholics in America were as clearly opposed to intervention or to violent rebellion which might lead to intervention in Mexico as you are the rest of us might be able more satisfactorily to bring moral pressure to bear on the particular problems of the Mexican Church. I have in my hand as I write a copy of that quite misleading and dangerous tract issued by the Knights of Columbus entitled "Red Mexico."[8] I can refer you to some very bellicose statements by men like Judge Talley[9] and Congressman Boylan.[10] I can also cite to you the case of one of my Irish friends who recites to my wife a list of Mexican atrocities naming a priest as her source of information, which atrocities, in her opinion, should lead the United States to intervene. Finally, while I have been impressed by the formal utterances of the hierarchy against intervention, I should be more impressed if there would be equally outspoken condemnation of acts that might lead to intervention.

2. I confess that Catholic appeals to religious freedom, especially from Mexico, leave me a little cold, as do similar appeals from our Communist friends. The evidence is complete that the Roman Catholic Church in its time of power in Mexico neither believed in nor practiced religious freedom as we understand it. In the case of Mexican Catholics as in the case of Communists I am willing to agree that believers in freedom can scarcely justify their faith by adopting the tactics of its enemies. Nevertheless, it would be well for those who

---

spondence; and to Father Patrick W. Gearty, acting archivist of the Catholic University of America, for making it available from the Ryan Papers in the University Archives.

[7] Ryan sent the second article, cited in footnote 5.

[8] Supreme Council, Knights of Columbus, *Red Mexico: The Facts,* pamphlet (New Haven, 1926).

[9] Alfred E. Talley, formerly a judge in New York City, organizer of the Association for the Protection of Religious Rights in Mexico.

[10] Representative John J. Boylan, Democrat of New York, who introduced a resolution urging the President to sever diplomatic relations with Mexico.

appeal to freedom to give evidence of a belief in it when they have power as when they are persecuted.

3. Experience and observation in life, somewhat to my own sorrow, force me to a rather more relative standard of judgment than once I had. I do not believe and have never said that every act of the Calles government against the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico is justified. Rather the contrary, as I shall presently point out. But you have correctly quoted my opinion that Mexican conditions do not permit us in fairness to apply American liberal standards of judgment. I do not claim expert knowledge of Mexican affairs but I have taken rather unusual pains to read what has been published on the subject and to talk to men whose judgment I trust. I include in this statement such defenses of the Catholic Church as I have found. And I am still of the opinion that, at least until very recently, the record of the church is very far from conforming to the standards of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in matters of political or economic justice.

4. It is not quite true that I have disposed of the Mexican Church quarrel in the words which you correctly quote. On other occasions I have discussed the quarrel more fully. I take the liberty of enclosing a few other comments.[11] I have also privately urged on people who I hoped might have the ear of President Calles a more moderate policy toward the church. I should be disposed to go farther in my comment if two things could be made clear to me: (a) That the whole influence of the church, privately as well as publicly, through the Knights of Columbus as well as through the Bishops was against intervention or those acts which might reasonably be expected to lead to intervention. (b) If the church in Mexico would end a policy by which millions of immortal souls are, according to Catholic theology, imperilled in order that a political government may be brought to terms. I simply cannot understand how the church, on the basis of its own theology, could suspend all public services thereby inevitably making it far more difficult for simple people to obtain the means of salvation in an effort to bring Calles to terms. In spite of all disclaimers such an act looks to me meaningless except as it might serve to instigate rebellion. Difficult as the Calles regulation made the work of the church, it was not the Calles government which brought to an end all public services by priests.

---

[11] These statements were returned to Mr. Thomas and are, therefore, not available in the Ryan Papers.

I have written frankly because of my great respect for you personally and because I am seriously concerned about the situation. If you have time I should like your answer to these points.

Sincerely yours,
NORMAN THOMAS

* * * * *

February 15, 1927.

My dear Mr. Thomas:

I thank you for your letter of February 10 and shall try to comply with your expressed wish that I deal with the points which you have discussed. I shall take them up in the order in which they appear in your letter.

1. As regards violent statements found in Knights of Columbus pamphlets and in the reported utterances of certain individual Catholics, I have no apology to offer, because I have never had any sympathy with that kind of procedure, nor do I think that the Catholic Body in this country should be held responsible for such utterances or even called upon to repudiate them. So far as war or intervention by force is concerned, I have never heard or read a statement by any Catholic in favor of either. (This is the fact of the situation, whatever judgment may be passed upon the loose and misleading form of words used by the Knights of Columbus in the resolution adopted at their convention last August.)[12]

However, you seem to be disturbed at the absence of "outspoken condemnation of acts that might lead to intervention". This is a very elastic conception, one about which there is room for great difference of opinion and which might be interpreted so strictly as to condemn and foreclose discussion of the anti-religious persecution which was going on in Mexico long before the oil dispute became critical. While I am opposed to war with Mexico, or the sending of American military forces into that country, I should welcome severance of diplomatic relations, if that should be brought about in accordance with just and legal requirements. I take this position because I think the results would be not only favorable to the just demands of American property interests but to the welfare of the Mexican people. Nevertheless, I resent and should regard as quite impertinent the charge that in welcoming justified breaking off of diplomatic relations I am virtually declaring in favor of the use of military force. Nothing of the sort need follow or is likely to follow. I reserve the right to determine for my self what acts "might lead to intervention."

---

[12] The Knights had authorized a million-dollar campaign of education "to the end that the politics of Soviet Russia shall be eliminated from the philosophy of American life and the ideals of liberty of conscience and democratic freedom may extend to our afflicted fellow human beings beyond the Rio Grande." Quoted in Rice, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

2. Your reference to the "time of power" of the Catholic Church in Mexico when it neither believed in nor practiced religious freedom reminds me of the story of the Bowery youth who insisted on "beating up" a young Jewish schoolmate. The latter wanted to know the reason of the onslaught. "You are a Jew and the Jews killed Christ," replied the belligerent young defender of Christianity. "But that was nineteen hundred years ago," protested the littel [*sic*] son of Abraham. "I don't care," was the reply; "I heard about it only yesterday.["]

There is another story about the farmer who exclaimed on having ox tail soup put before him for the first time: "I'll say that's going pretty far back for soup." Really, the attitude of the Catholic Church in Mexico toward religious freedom pleaded in extenuation (and sometimes in justification) of the present persecution by the Mexican government is trivial, in addition to being contrary to the very essence of liberalism. Toward the close of our fight for the release of the political prisoners, Ralph Chaplin, who had been one of them, informed me that he was afraid some of the Communist and I.W.W. men who had been incarcerated would not have done for me what I was striving to do for them had our respective positions been reversed. Of course, I had been aware of that from the beginning of our efforts, but I never gave it a second thought. I believe that it was an entirely irrelevant consideration. Apparently, a very large portion of the American liberals think that the alleged illiberal attitude of the Mexican Church is sufficient reason for denying fundamental liberties to that Church and its members.

In a half hearted manner you seem to concede this principle, but you go on to say that the Mexican bishops ought to show a belief in freedom when they have power as when they are persecuted. I confess I do not understand this sentence. If it has any meaning it is intended to convey the implication that the Mexican Church has opposed liberty within recent years; otherwise we are reminded again of the story about ox tail soup. The bishops and clergy now living in Mexico are surely not responsible for what happened a century ago. (In this connection I would remind you of the questions I addressed to the CHRISTIAN CENTURY.)[13] What evidence is there that opposition to liberty or to social reform has been manifested by the Church in Mexico during the last half century [?] If you cannot answer that question with definite facts, the sentence in your letter which I am now discussing is not only meaningless but unjust and cruel.

3. "American liberal standards of judgment" are in my opinion not relevant at all. It seems to me that they are of universal application since they are based, in substance at least, upon fundamental human needs and human rights. If this position is given up, liberalism goes with it and one adopts what is essentially a tory attitude, namely willingness to concede to a given class of people such liberty as the tory thinks is good for that class. You say that you do not believe "that every act of the Calles government against the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico is justified." Will you pardon me for the frank statement that this form of language (which is rather common among our American liberals) is pure and simple evasion? Will you tell me what one of the persecuting acts you think is justified and why?

Whether the record of the Mexican Church conforms "to the standar[d]s of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in mat[t]ers of political or economic justice," is not a fair question or a fair test. The only fair question as to the facts (not the principle) of the situation is whether the Mexican Church has opposed political or economic reforms in the last half century. I challenge you to produce the evidence which would justify an affirmative answer (to this question.)

4. The two conditions which you lay down as preliminary to your possible adoption of a genuine liberal attitude toward the Mexican persecution show, I regret to say, the mind of the tory rather than of the liberal. You would condone the continued denial of fundamental liberty because you do not like the policies adopted by the victims of the persecution or by their friends. The sentence prefixed ("a") in this paragraph indicates that you do not believe that the Catholic Church in this country or its bishops or the Knights of Columbus hold privately what they say publicly. If that is a fair inference, I have nothing more to [say]. "More in sorrow than in anger" I fall back upon the explanation of traditional but personally inculpable prejudice. This explanation is the only one that seems to fit the astonishing implication contained in your sentence prefixed

---

[13] These questions were not printed in the *Christian Century,* but they did appear in the *N.C.W.C. Bulletin* which Ryan sent to Thomas.

("b"). You are aware, I assume[,] that the order suspending acts of religious worship came from Rome. Your knowledge of the history of the Papacy must have suggested the judgment that the Roman authorities have had a fairly long experience in dealing with practical situations and that they would not enforce such a drastic rule without very grave reasons. The reason which you gratuitiously assign, namely, "that a political government may be brought to terms," attributes to the Roman authorities a degree of stupidity which is pretty rare in criticisms of them [by] intelligent persons. I cannot understand how you came to be ignorant of the explanation which appeared in print many times at the time when the order was issued, and subsequently. Acceptance of the government order for registration of priests and churches would have meant, and was intended to mean, the complete control of religious worship and of the priests by the Mexican government. The Pope had to choose between no worship at all and a condition which would have made the carrying on of religious services worse than impossible. It seems to me that a decent regard for the laws of charity and justice should have prevented you from excogitating this astonishing explanation of the papal order which closed the Churches. (A few days ago Bishop Diaz,[14] who was expelled from Mexico simply because his defense of the position of the Church as published in the NEW YORK TIMES was troublesome to Calles, very earnestly adjured the General Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference[15] to have nothing to do with any of his countrymen who might come here seeking aid for a revolution against the Calles government. For aught I know, this is the attitude of all the Mexican Bishops. Remember that Diaz was the spokesman for the entire hierarchy until his words became insufferable to Calles.)

What you and many other friends of the Calles government do not seem to realize is that the present persecution is carried on by men who hate religion as such and wish to destroy it utterly. Rabbi Isaac Landman has recently stated that when he saw Morones[16] and pressed him with pertinent questions, Morones admitted that this was the ultimate object of the government. Within the last few weeks the government closed the ecclesiastical seminary at Durango. Before this was done, however, the agents of the government offered to the priests

[14] Pascual Díaz, S.J., Bishop of Tabásco, formerly secretary of and occasional spokesman for the Mexican hierarchy.

[15] Father John J. Burke, C.S.P.

[16] Luis N. Morones, minister of the Department of the Interior.

a guarantee of complete security and freedom, if they would denounce the Pope and the Hierarchy of Mexico. When they unanimously refused they were arrested and taken to Mexico City. In this connection I would refer to an earlier statement of yours in which you condemn the Mexican bishops for forbidding Catholic children to attend the state schools. Are you aware that in these schools the teaching is not "neutral" as regards religion, but distinctly anti-religious and in some of the institutions contains such elements of immorality that I am sure you would not want you[r] children to get the benefit of such "instruction"[?]

At the beginning of your paragraph 4 you intimate that the two sentences which I quoted in my BULLETIN article do not adequately represent all that you have written on this subject. When I wrote the article I was not overlooking the statements that you had made previously. Today, I have re-read these paragraphs and I am still of the opinion that they are all fairly reflected in the two sentences which I quoted in the BULLETIN article. Everything that you have written on this subject in the L.I.D. news releases can be reduced to these two sentences. They all either charge the Mexican Church with opposition to religious, political and economic freedom or declare that American standards of liberty are inapplicable to Mexican conditions, or that some of the repressive measures against the Church in Mexico are justified. For the first of these propositions you have nowhere submitted evidence. The second and third are virtually synonymous. The answer to them is naturally the question: "Which principles in our Bill of Rights are not fairly applicable to Mexican conditions and which sections of the anti-religious provisions of the Mexican Constitution are defensible 'from the standpoint of justice'?" The easy utterance of the second and third proposition[s] without facing the questions which I have just asked seems to me to illustrate either a lack of courage or a lack of willingness to think these propositions through. (I am returning herewith your earlier statements with those sentences and parts of sentences underlined which I regard as either unsupported statements of assumed facts or clear indications that you do not believe in fundamental liberties as a matter of principle.)

In the very first thing that I published on the Mexican persecution, I complained that the majority of American liberals are, in this regard, showing themselves recreant to the principles of liberalism because they seem clearly to hold that certain of these principles should not be urged on behalf of certain people; and that the American liberals have no firm belief in any principles of individual liberty or individual rights except those which they or their friends want to use. What you have written on the Mexican situation seem[e]d to place you definitely within this classification. Indeed, the only violation of liberty that you seem at all concerned about is that which forbids in Mexico freedom of speech and freedom of the press. You are "not interested one way or another in the priests." You are not even interested enough [to] reflect that ninety priests in a Catholic population of more than 600,000 is ridiculously inadequate. The outrage upon religious freedom which this implies you do not think is worthwhile even to discuss.

Of course, this is pure and simple toryism. The quintessence of the tory attitude is the belief that onesself and one's friends should have all the liberty that they desire and that other people should have all the liberty that is good for the other people. How much liberty is good for other people is to be determined, of course, by the tory. I am enclosing herewith [s]ome statements recently made by a Methodist editor. So far as I know this is the first instance of an American Protestant clergyman discussing the Mexican persecution in terms that are worthy of a liberal and a follower of Christ. In the paragraph that I have marked you will find that he has a different conception from yours of the reasons which moved the Pope to order worship in the churches discontinued.[17]

I must ask your pardon for inflicting this very long letter upon you, but I could not well dispose in shorter space of the many issues mentioned or implied in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Ryan

* * * * *

February 17, 1927.

My dear Mr. Thomas:

You may be interested in the two articles on Fascism which I am enclosing herewith.[18] My main object in bringing them to your attention is to keep the record straight. As you are probably aware, a few

---

[17] This is probably a reference to Edward T. Devine, dean of the Graduate School at the American University. The following month Ryan expressed his appreciation of Devine's generous comments on the Catholic position in Mexico. Ryan Papers.

[18] Ryan, "The Doctrine of Fascism" and "Fascism in Practice," *Commonweal,* V (November 17, 1926), 42-44; (November 24, 1926), 73-76.

Catholic papers in this country side stepped or put the soft pedal on the tyrannical performances of Mussolini because they liked some of the other things he was doing; which is exactly the line followed by most of our American liberals with reference to Calles. These two articles were written as a protest, although it was not so designated, against that inconsistency. From the dates you will observe that the papers appeared before the Pope uttered his denunciation of the Fascist theory of the omnipotent state, December 20.[19] The newspaper clipping which you will also find with this states correctly the reason why the Pope closed the Churches in Mexico and the reason why the government is not permitting services in private houses or chapels. The government wants to subordinate the priests and their activities to its own purposes; the Pope realizes exactly what that would mean for religion in Mexico.

The paragraphs which I have quoted on a separate sheet are taken from a long letter written by Fred Kerby[20] to whom I had sent a copy of my BULLETIN article. The position which he takes is entirely logical and against it [I] have not a word to say except to reject it. I cannot accuse him or anyone who takes this attitude of inconsistency or of defection from the gospel of liberalism.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Ryan

* * * * *

February 25, 1927.

My dear Dr. Ryan:

I read carefully your two letters and expect to read them again.

Before I reply may I remind you that I have a pretty good reputation against bigotry. I have fought Ku Kluxism of all sorts; I espoused the Irish cause to the horror of some of my Protestant friends; I loathe religious controversy in politics. Nevertheless facts must be faced.

I believe that the Catholic Church has a real case against the present Mexican laws. I should be willing to argue that case with a great deal more emphasis than I have heretofore done if and when I am persuaded that to do so will not play into the hands of the Knights of Columbus agitation or help to bring about a withdrawal of recognition. I can quite believe that you do not want a withdrawal of recognition to be a step toward intervention. Practically and objectively I think withdrawal of recognition would inevitably be a step in that direction.

---

[19] New York *Times,* December 21, 1926.

[20] A correspondent of Ryan's argued that every adult should be free to adopt his own religious belief, if any, without prior conditioning in his formative years.

As you can see from the foregoing, it is quite true that I am unwilling to take an absolutist position in this matter. In other words, I shall not say: "Let the principles of free speech be upheld in their entirety no matter what have been the antecedents of the present Mexican quarrel or what its consequences." I believe that Calles has shown statesman-like qualities and has given Mexico the most hopeful and forward looking government it has had for many years. I believe this on the testimony of a great many men and women, oral and written, whose judgment I trust. I believe it also on the basis of a slight personal acquaintance with Calles.

As for the Mexican Church, of course I can prove nothing first hand. I can only repeat that the testimony of men and women who have lived in Mexico and various articles and documents which I have read firmly persuade me that the Mexican Church by its acts of omission and commission has exploited the people in varying degree but with fair consistency from the time of the Spanish Conquest at least down to the fall of the Huerta government. Even the devout and ill fated Empress Carlotta had some harsh things to say about the priests in her time. These events do not go back as far as the ox's tail of your story. I believe that the actual condition of the Mexican peon today is the best proof of the failure of the Mexican hierarchy to do its Christian duty.

I am familiar with the reasons given by the Pope for suspending services. I cannot see how they are consistent with Catholic teachings of the importance of public masses and services and with a Christian conception of the way to overcome evil. History is full of instances where diplomats, secular and clerical, have denied in public that they wanted that for which they were privately working. In the light of modern psychology one can even understand how it is possible for a man to do this sort of thing without being a hypocrite. For instance I know certain honorable bankers who hotly deny that they meant to be imperialistic or encourage imperialism by their actions in Nicaragua! I do not say that the Church in Mexico is consciously or unconsciously seeking ends opposed to its public professions or that the Knights of Columbus in the United States are doing it. I hope they are not. But familiarity not only with secular history but with Church history, both Catholic and Protestant, justifies a certain caution.

Your correspondent makes some impression on me by his remarks on education. I don't love parochial schools, Protestant or Catholic, but I believe them less of a danger in our country than the religion of statism inculcated by the defunct Oregon school laws. Nevertheless I have been somewhat sympathetic with the Russians who have insisted that church schools were the enemies of progress in that country, and I am less disposed to quarrel with Calles on forbidding religious instruction in primary schools than on some other of his laws. Frankly, my attitude on this educational question would be guided by observation of facts in local situations. An emergency in Russia or Mexico might justify, at least partially, what I should not justify in the United States where church schools cannot have the exclusive power they might have in these other countries over the minds of the young.

Anyway, I am somewhat amused at being lectured by any Roman Catholic, even yourself, on the subject of devotion to absolute principles of civil liberty. It was reading your own excellent book on Church and State[21] which convinced me how relative Catholic standards must be on this subject. I cannot put my hand on your book at this moment but if I find it I shall add a postscript giving references by pages to certain declarations of the Popes and your explanation of them. They made me very happy to be born in the country wherein it is not expedient for the Church to assert the power that historically it has claimed. Certainly you yourself will not deny that the Mexican Church when it had the power—and that, after all, was not so long ago—used it with at least as little liberality toward other religions as Calles shows toward it. Two wrongs do not make one right, but in this world of ours one wrong helps explain another.

I don't suppose we are going to get anywhere by continued debate. My position is this: With regard to the Church in Mexico, suspicious as I am of it and its record, I believe it is entitled, as a matter of justice and sound policy, to more liberal treatment than it is now receiving. I shall go as far in saying so as in my fallible judgment I think I can without helping to stir up an attitude in America which will make intervention more possible. I am not enough of an absolutist on this matter to want to fight for civil liberty in Mexico in a way that may aid the aggressions of oil magnates. I have taken and shall take precisely the same position with regard to regulations by Chinese Nationalists which may cripple Protestant enterprises in China.

---

[21] Ryan, *The State and the Church* (New York, 1922).

Meanwhile let me tell you that I am sorry I have to differ on this point with a man whose courage, sincerity and disinterestedness I so greatly admire as I do yours. I want especially to thank you for your stand against Fascism.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS

* * * * *

March 3, 1927.

My dear Mr. Thomas:

As you suggest in your letter of February 25, "we are not going to get anywhere by continuing debate." Nevertheless, I think it may be useful for me to make my position clearer on two points.

The first has to do with the "rigidity" of my view concerning the principles of individual liberty. I do not feel obliged to support these principles actively everywhere, in all circumstances. For example, if I thought that my agitation for these principles on behalf of the Mexican Church would be injurious to my country I should refrain; for I believe that my obligation to the United States is greater than my obligation to my co-religionists in some other country. In that case, I should remain silent. Happily, I am not compelled to choose between these alternatives, since I believe that American interests and the cause of civil liberty in Mexico, and, indeed, the welfare of the Mexican people, are all bound up together.

You refer to the Catholic doctrine on religious liberty as you have seen it stated in my book on The State and the Church and intimate that it is not in harmony with the principles which I am urging on behalf of the Church in Mexico. I might retort that all the prominent Christian denominations acted upon the principle of non-toleration and repression of other denominations, but that would not be a profitable exercise. As you will recall, I pointed out in that book that in the age in which we live complete religious freedom is the only reasonable and practical rule. Anyhow it is the rule adopted by all modern States.

Therefore, I have a right to assume it and urge it against the tyrannical conduct of any modern State.

The second point that I want to discuss is that of the facts. In the present controversy, the question of the facts is practically quite as important as that of the principles. You mention the sources of your information and conclusions concerning the "exploitation" of the Mexican people by the Mexican Church. Do you have entire confidence in these sources? Next June I shall complete twenty-five years of teaching, mostly graduate students. My work in this field has included moral theology, ethics, canon law, sociology, economics, and political science. Year by year I have been confirmed in the judgment which I reluctantly formed at least twenty years ago, that this so-called scientific age of ours is as credulous and unscientific as any that has preceded it since the tenth century. It is a common reproach levelled at the Middle Ages that the people took their beliefs and opinions entirely from authority, Popes, bishops, priests, and theologians. Today the vast majority of educated persons follow the same procedure. In the physical, social and historical sciences they uncritically accept the second or third hand testimony and judgments of journalists, popularizers, propagandists, and politicians. So far as I have been able to judge, this is exactly the practice adopted by the vast majority of Americans with regard to the history of the Church in Mexico.

I am not so naive as to believe that the Mexican Church was guilty of no sins [of] omission or commission. On the contrary, I think I have sufficient warrant for the judgment that many offenses of both kinds must be laid at the doors of the Mexican Church during the eighteenth century. From what I know of the anti-religious laws prevailing in Mexico since 1857, however, I am impelled to believe that in the period since intervening the Church has possessed very little power for "exploiting" the people. Hence, my questions to the *Christian Century* covered only the last fifty years. Hence, I still maintain that the current charges against the Mexican Church are strongly suggestive of the story of the farmer and the ox tail soup.

If you have any reliable information or can refer me to any reliable sources which show that, in the last half century, the Church in Mexico has "exploited" the people, I shall be genuinely grateful to you for making me acquainted with them. In this connection I would mention 1 doctoral thesis, published by the University of Texas, entitled "Some Aspects of the Agrarian Question in Mexico," by

Helen Phipps.[22] The study was made in Columbia University. In general it is by no means favorable to the Mexican Church,—rather the contrary, in fact. Hence, the emphasis which I place upon the following quotations, taken from pages 131, 132: "The second revolution (1857) . . . . . . broke the power of the clergy, but in so doing gave a tremendous influence to the landed aristocracy and caused the masses to sink lower and lower into misery. The third revolution (1910) was directed against the remaining privileged group. The condition of the masses was far worse in 1910 than it had been in 1810. . . ."

If these generalizations are correct, "the actual condition of the Mexican peon today" is not, [as] you say, a proof of the failure of the Mexican Hierarchy. It is rather due, mainly at least, to the revolution of 1857 and the subsequent reign of grafters, politicians and plutocrats.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. RYAN

* * * * *

March 5, 1927.

My dear Dr. Ryan:

I don't think we will get much further discussing principles. I do want all the light I can get on facts and I am grateful to you for the article by Helen Phipps which I shall look up at the earliest possible moment.

Granting that the landed aristocracy which grew up after 1857 was as bad or worse than the Church, was it not on the whole allied with the Church? In this matter I put more reliance on men like Carleton Beals,[23] Ernest Gruening,[24] and various Protestant missionaries and Mexican Socialists or radicals than you do, though I try to make some discount for the prejudices of the latter groups.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS, per F.S.

Dictated but not read

* * * * *

---

[22] Helen Phipps, *Some Aspects of the Agrarian Question in Mexico: A Historical Study* (Austin, 1925).

[23] Writer on Latin-American affairs and a frequent contributor to *The Nation*.

[24] Writer on Mexican affairs; cf. note 1.

March 10, 1927.

My dear Mr. Thomas:

In your letter of March 5, you throw out the question whether the . . . landed aristocracy which prevailed in Mexico after 1857 "was not on the whole allied with the Church?". I do not know, although I have made some efforts to get the facts. I am inclined [to] think that the proper answer is in the negative, since the bishops and the clergy of Mexico were deprived of the power they once exercised in that country and even under Diaz were merely tolerated. My impression is that they exercised less influence upon the government than have several Protestants in this country exercised upon our American government through the Anti-Saloon League.

In any case, I do not think much of your "authorities". For some time I have been convinced that ——— is an unscrupulous liar and I am informed on good authority that he has for several months been in the pay of the Calles government. From what little I know of ———, I should infer that he [is] decidedly "anti-clerical".[25] If the Protestant missionaries are fairly represented by Bishop Cannon[26] and Bishop Miller,[27] they are utterly unveracious and unreliable. As for the trustworthiness of the Mexican Socialists on this question, the least said the better.

After all this is an historical question and there are only two kinds of testimony that are competent, namely, that of reliable eye witnesses and that of authentic documents. No critical student of history would put any of your "authorities" in either of these classes. You would not condemn your brother or your wife on such "testimony". So far as I can see, other American liberals who have brought these charges against the Mexican Church of the last half century can produce no better "authorities" than those mentioned in your letter. In these circumstances, I think I am justified in adding one more to my reasons for holding that the present age is as credulous as any that has gone before it since the tenth century.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. RYAN

* * * * *

---

[25] The names appear in the original.

[26] James Cannon, Jr., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, who had been in charge of the Church's missionary work in Mexico for the previous eight years.

[27] George A. Miller, Methodist Episcopal Administrator in Mexico City.

March 25, 1927.

Dear Dr. Ryan:

On my return from a Mid Western trip I find your letter of March 10 with its enclosure THE CHURCH AND AGRARIAN REFORM IN MEXICO. The latter I have read with interest. I am very glad to get material of this sort.

Your letter makes it clear that if my bias is somewhat anti-clerical in Mexico yours is pro-clerical and each of us would discount the other's authorities. I suppose that that cannot be helped. However, I will say this: If I could believe that your point of view is the point of view of your Church I would have an entirely different feeling about things. Having read with some care recent articles and statements by various Catholics including David Goldstein,[28] whom I shall not attempt to characterize in this letter, and other Knights of Columbus, I am seriously alarmed at the spirit they are stirring up.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS

---

[28] Convert to Catholicism from Judaism, prominent as a street-corner evangelist.

MISCELLANY

A NOTE ON CARDINAL ALLEN'S POLITICAL THOUGHT

By

THOMAS O. HANLEY*

With the accession of Queen Elizabeth I to the throne of England in 1558 there was initiated a new series of penal laws against Catholics which struck a heavy blow at the priesthood and its ministrations in England where priests could no longer be trained. The remnants of the clergy were dying out or enduring imprisonment and other hardships obstructed their care of souls. In the face of this situation, William Allen (1532-1594), an English secular priest who was created a cardinal in 1587, came forward and organized seminaries in France and eventually was co-founder of the English College of Rome in 1578. To the increasing number of secular priests he then added a large number of Jesuits whom he had enlisted through the co-operation of Robert Persons.[1]

The arrival of missionaries of these continental colleges brought sterner measures in England against Catholics to whom they secretly ministered. These heroic Catholics, both clergy and laymen, martyrs among them, greatly strengthened the faith. Nevertheless, William Allen feared a breaking point in their heroism. There were suggestions of this in the numbers of Catholics who subscribed to Anglican services with the casuistry that this was merely an act of civil obedience. As a result, Allen began to take notice of the political forces which were at work against Elizabeth in England and elsewhere, and he began to fear that the Catholic faith could be preserved only with Elizabeth's overthrow.[2]

There were four aspects to this contest with Elizabeth. Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland, was regarded by many as the legitimate

* Father Hanley, S.J., is instructor in history in Marquette University.

[1] Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England* (London, 1950-1954), Volume I; Peter Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent* (New York, 1914).

[2] Martin Haile, *An Elizabethan Cardinal, William Allen* (London, 1914) is the most satisfactory biography of Allen.

heir to the throne of England. Her party among the nobility aimed at the removal of Elizabeth. When Elizabeth's life seemed endangered from illness, Catholics looked for liberation under the Catholic Queen of Scotland.[3] A second element in this intrigue was the Duke of Guise in France, consorting with Lennox and his plans for an uprising in support of James Stuart. A third contestant was Philip II himself, who did not identify himself entirely with either Mary or Guise. He had his own entirely political quarrel with Elizabeth for her abetting his enemies in the rebellion of the Netherlands. He was not blind, however, to the plight of his fellow Catholics in England, as his financial support of their continental seminaries testified. Yet on the basis of his marriage to Mary Tudor and his Lancastrian ancestry he had some kind of personal claim to the throne. Consequently, political interests overrode spiritual considerations.[4]

A final aspect of the forces against Elizabeth lay in the spiritual and temporal activity of the popes. By an ancient feudal agreement, England was a fief of the Holy See. The Protestant Revolt had not, in the eyes of Rome, destroyed the spiritual authority of the pope over the queen; nor done away with the mediaeval unity of Europe over which the pope presided as arbiter of international and even internal political conflicts. In Elizabeth's day the popes were not above calling on this two-fold power. In 1570 Pius V excommunicated Elizabeth, and later, mediaeval fashion, looked to Philip II as the secular arm to execute the political consequences of this act. The pope thus hoped to put an end to the persecution of Catholics by overthrowing Elizabeth.

After the bull of excommunication, William Allen fell in with the political as well as the ecclesiastical drift of events, carried forward by the impetus of the four-fold forces mentioned above. There is ample evidence of Allen's rendezvous with the Duke of Guise and Lennox, and when these and other sources of aid collapsed, he turned to Philip

---

[3] Ludwig von Pastor, *The History of the Popes* (London, 1923-1953), XVIII, 192-195.

[4] *Ibid.*, chapter vi; Haile, *op. cit.*, pp. 222-228. One is seldom certain of the decisive consideration in Philip's policies. Merriman seems to stress the nationalistic aspect of his policy for the empire; cf. Roger B. Merriman, *The Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and the New* (New York, 1936), Volume IV. Bohdan Chudoba, *Spain and the Empire, 1519-1643* (Chicago, 1952) effectively shows Philip II's assumption of leadership for a unified Christian Europe. It may be that Philip's design for England had greater spiritual content than at first appears.

II. It was not until the 1580's, however, that Philip seemed ready to take military action for the liberation of the English Catholics.[5]

The English Catholics, lay and clerical, had come to look to Allen as their spiritual leader and adviser, even though he was out of England during these distressing times. He had particularly given them heart by his pamphlet debate with William Cecil, Lord Burghley, the secretary of Elizabeth. His notable indictment of Elizabethan intolerance entitled, *A True, sincere and modest defense of English catholiques . . .*, uncovered the malice of the crown's intention in drafting and applying penal laws.[6] Burghley implicitly admitted that the Catholics in England were used as hostages whom he could punish in order to deter foreign opposition to his regime.[7] Allen reasoned that English priests and seminaries were driven abroad by the queen's policy; and it was her intolerance of Catholics that made them seek liberation from injustice through the help of foreigners.[8]

One of the most noteworthy elements of Allen's *True . . . Defense* was, perhaps, his granting that Catholics in England might proffer obedience in civil matters to the excommunicated Elizabeth without offense to their conscience. As a condition for this submission toleration of Catholics was demanded. Allen exhorted Burghley to observe the practice of the French Catholic kings with regard to Huguenots in this respect and the example of Protestant rulers in central Europe. Such an attitude by Allen was not in accord with the literal statements of Pius V's bull of 1570 which had excommunicated the queen; yet the pope in practice did not urge excommunication of those who gave civil obedience to Elizabeth. Pius V had issued the bull at the time of the Rising in the North at the urging of Englishmen who were seeking enlightenment for their conscience.[9] Allen himself had curbed all discussion of the matter in his seminaries, but in his *True . . . Defense,* however, he did not forego an apology for the papal power to depose and for the regard in which the popes were wont to urge citizens to hold an excommunicated ruler.[10] It became evident in Allen's attitude that this apology did not too well blend with his justification of current Catholic obedience to Elizabeth. He manifested a salutary restraint in these circumstances, which is important to note. This would seem to indicate his awareness that the circumstances which may have justified the power to depose had passed from the European scene in which he was at the time involved. Theoretical disharmony of this kind, however, did not undercut the validity of his case against Burghley, who was involved in a policy dictated by a morally disreputable principle. And it was this message that the Catholics in England welcomed.

---

[5] Pastor, *op. cit.,* XVIII, 196, 199, 217; Hughes, *op. cit.,* III, 420, contains the pertinent passages of the bull.

[6] Subsequent references are to the more recent edition, *Allen's Defense of English Catholics* (St. Louis, 1914). Burghley's views are in *The Execution of Justice in England . . .* (London, 1583).

[7] The situation of the political decision, however, was more complex than Burghley could represent in his written work, which was likewise the case with Allen.

[8] Hughes, *op. cit.,* II, 375-376. Cf. also W. K. Jordan, *The Development of Toleration in England* (Cambridge, 1932), I, 395-398.

[9] *Allen's Defense,* II, 143 ff.

As one may see from an examination of Allen's *True . . . Defense,* his enemies could find implications in it for discrediting him in England, and, indeed, forever in "official" English history. There exist forgeries which distort the churchman's views, designed to further the cause of his enemies along this line. One work of Allen, questionable in this respect, however, has enough evidence of authenticity to merit consideration as an expression of his thought on questions which were raised in his *True . . . Defense.* Moreover some light will be thrown on the internal evidence this work gives of its authenticity. It was entitled, *Defence of Sir William Stanley's Surrender of Deventer January 29, 1586-7.*[11] The instance under discussion was the surrender of Catholic soldiers fighting for England against Spain during the revolt in the Netherlands. A letter of inquiry to Allen and his response constituted the substance of the publication.

Sir William Stanley was a professional soldier and a Catholic. Early in his career he had served with the Spanish forces after which he then joined the English army and served in Ireland, proceeding from there with Leicester's forces to the Netherlands to help in the revolt against Spain. Questions about military and civil authority arose from the outset. Leicester himself seemed to be beyond his orders in this expedition. Also, according to Stanley, Leicester had released Stanley from his own authority upon Leicester's departure from the enterprise. Stanley, however, continued his command and successfully besieged the town of Devanter. While in occupation he began secretly to negotiate a bloodless surrender of the town to the Spanish forces of Parma who were in the area. He left his soldiers, who were largely Irish Catholic mercenaries, free to imitate his transfer of allegiance to Philip II.[12]

---

[10] *Ibid.,* II, Chapter VI and p. 144. For a further discussion of these matters in the context of Catholic Church-State traditions cf. the writer's study, *Their Rights and Liberties* (Westminster, Maryland, 1959), Chapter II.

[11] *Copie of a Letter written by M. Doctor Allen: Concerning the Yeelding up, of the Citie of Dauentrie, unto his Catholike Maiestie, by Sir William Stanley . . .* (Antuarpe, 1587). The edition used here is Thomas Heywood's *Defence of Sir William Stanley's Surrender of Devanter January 29, 1586-7* (Manchester, 1851).

During and after this course of action Stanley, who was a recognized and honored member of his profession, continued to defend the integrity of his action. Roger Ashton, one of his colleagues, however, had grave misgivings in his Catholic conscience. He wrote to William Allen and described the confusion Stanley's surrender had caused in the minds of his fellow English Catholics, who were accustomed to conscientious obedience to civil authorities.[13]

Allen approached the problem of Stanley from more than one viewpoint. He spoke in terms of restitution of property taken unjustly from another and found Stanley correct in giving back to Philip the town to which the king had title and which Stanley had momentarily usurped. The English soldiers, he continued, were carrying on an unjust war and one might not advance such a cause. Having done so, restitution of any gain was to be made. If this amounted to revolt on the part of Stanley and others, there was justification for it. "Who can not of a very moral reason," Allen wrote, "thinketh it not a most glorious resolutio[n], to reuolt to that side, with which al true honor, and justice, & al conditions of lawful warres doe stand"? After all, in serving the Dutch, the English were themselves stirring up revolt, and not for a just cause such as the Spanish had. "In their [Englishmen] warres," he wrote by way of indictment of Burghley's policies, "they serue themselues of Catholikes: & by English Catholikes, they destroy Catholikes abrode: that forreine Catholikes being ouerthrown, they may more easely, ouerthrowe their owne at home."[14] To revolt against the execution of such evil designs was heroic.

Allen did not stop with putting such a heavy burden on the Catholic soldier as these statements imply. "Of all men in the world," he continued, "the souldiar should most specially attend to his conscience . . . and being assured that if he dye, in any knowen euel cause, and namely in this fight against God, and defence of Haeretikes, he is doubtles to be damned for euer." It is here that he touched upon the status of the excommunicated ruler Elizabeth and the obedience owed to her as a heretic. "As contraiwise," he added, "to dye in lawful warres, for defence of true Religion, & Gods honour, in most cases, [is] plaine martyrdome."[15] Such was the role of one in the ranks of Philip's forces, the role Stanley continued to play after the surrender of Devanter.

---

[12] Cf. Heywood's introduction, *op. cit.*, in which he uses from the Harleian MSS, "The Examination of John Flud, servante to Sir William Stanley."

[13] Haile, *op. cit.*, pp. 289-295, 311, 344, 345. Heywood uses the Bibliothèque National copy of the letter of Ashton.

[14] *Allen's Letter*, pp. 17, 20.

Whatever may be thought theoretically of Allen's *Devanter Letter,* his fellow Catholics in England took a very practical view of the consequences of Allen's line of reasoning. The Jesuit, Thomas Stanney, writing from England to Robert Persons, reported that the reaction was not favorable. With several others Stanney had discussed the contents of the *Devanter Letter* and nearly all had concluded that it was not in conformity with what they had known of Allen. "Most of us resolved," he wrote, "that Mr. Allen would never have overshott himself so fowly in these times contrary to his former wrytings and protestations . . . ." The position of the soldiers and their leader, William Stanley, at Devanter was otherwise than the purported Allen letter had described it. "They fought against Spaniards," Stanney explained, "as being enemies of England, and not as Catholicks."[16] In a joint statement, Stanney's group further developed this view: "Her Majesty maketh no title or challenge to these provinces, [of the Netherlands] but only for defence of our neighbors and safety of our country deteyneth them." To defend their own kingdom, Catholics like Stanley must do their duty for the cause of the queen in the Netherlands. As for the restoration of the captured town of Devanter, "Noe law either divine or human bindeth to restitution when the same cannot be done without detriment of our honour, danger of our life, hazard of friends, etc."[17] To these Catholics in England the contest with Philip II was political and involved the safety of their temporal society, which they had a right to defend. Philip was not a liberator, pure and simple, of their spiritual bondage, for he would have his price. It was hoped that the spiritual liberation could be gained by other means than political subjection to Spain.

---

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] Stanney to Persons, October 23, 1587, in *Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen,* edited by Thomas F. Knox, *et al.* (London, 1882), p. 300.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 301.

Stanney's associates felt that Allen had understood all of this and sympathized with their viewpoint. The *Devanter Letter,* consequently, was an enigma to them and led them to question its authenticity. "Most of us resolved," Stanney wrote, "that it was not unlike some malicious man to make our cause odious to the world, to have published this book under the name of Mr. Allen, thinking thereby to demonstrate us all traytors to our Prince and country."[18] There is no doubt that Allen overshot the conservative tone of a *True . . . Defense,* but it is hard to see that the ideas of the *Devanter Letter* were basically different in its assumptions. The reckless tone of the *Devanter Letter* suggests, however, that Allen's enemies may have corrupted the original text, still leaving some plausible expression which was faithful to the author's view. Yet, Allen's biographer does not hesitate to attribute the letter to him.[19]

The aggressive spirit of the *Devanter Letter,* and its contrast with the attitude of Catholics residing in England, however, admits of explanation. As long as there was hope of a Stuart ascending the throne of England there would be a strong sentiment among Catholics in England to overthrow Elizabeth. This the English Catholics abroad would share in preference to an exclusively Spanish settlement. Yet, when the hope of an English dominated revolt faded and Philip alone emerged as the only potential force, the attitudes of Allen's party on the continent drifted apart from the beleaguered Catholics in England. Philip's course was too uncertain and his leadership uninspiring to Catholics in England.

This uncertainty and lack of inspiration Allen himself did not share. "His patriotism, and no man ever loved his country more," his biographer correctly says, "consisted in a passionate desire for its greatest good, which could only be obtained by reunion with the Church; and which he had been brought to believe could now be achieved solely by the intervention of the power of Spain."[20] There is no doubt that the other possibilities of deliverance had disappeared by 1586. In this context the tone of the *Devanter Letter* was what we might expect of Allen, now faced with what was the last chance of deliverance. Why could the incident of Devanter not be repeated in the north of England, even along the whole eastern coast, as the

---

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] Haile, *op. cit.,* pp. 191-193. Knox, *op. cit.,* does not include this letter in his collection.

[20] *Ibid.,* p. 331.

Spanish Armada landed its forces? Elizabeth had always feared the loyalty of her armies, some of which had a majority of Catholics.

It would seem that Allen did not see beyond this point. What would be the procedures after the invasion succeeded? Would Philip assert his power beyond the circumscriptions of Mary Tudor's reign? Would a Stuart assume power and, if so, was the faith of James VI reliable as a foundation for the religious liberty of English Catholics? Would they be ruled in the final analysis by Philip II whose political spirit, whatever his ardent Catholicism, was alien to the cherished heritage of the Magna Charta and parliamentary government? Who knew better than the Catholic nobles, recently defeated in the uprisings in the north, the unviable condition of the military expedition about which the clergyman was so enthusiastic? Who could understand better than the ordinary Catholic soldiers and their leaders from the Catholic nobility what governmental recriminations to expect for their families in the event of probable failure? Allen had seemed aware of the real problems when he wrote his *True . . . Defense*. It is understandable that this realism escaped him in the desperate hours on the eve of the Armada's invasion of England.

In light of the above evidence one can find a definite structure to Allen's thought as it is reflected in the *Devanter Letter*. One should not, however, by this evidence put him at complete odds with the Catholics in England, as some would do. No one knows the number of Catholics who were loyal to Elizabeth. The only thing that is certain is that they were not loyal to Philip. They were not beyond revolting. There is no telling if they would have revolted and executed new Devanters had the Spanish invasion demonstrated by its plan a reasonable hope for military success and, especially, establishment of an acceptable regime. English Catholics knew, as Allen did, that they had just grounds, even without a papal bull, for overthrowing the Elizabethan tyranny. They knew that, according to feudal notions, they could on the fundamental grounds of justice overthrow such a ruler and consort with the Stuart party for this purpose. They were not above being assisted in this by the French or the Spanish. But under no conditions, apparently, would they see complete power pass from the English nobility into Spanish hands. In the final analysis, then, William Allen was not as far from the mind of the English Catholics as is generally depicted. His point of divergence was one man and his specific scheme for 1588: Philip II and his Armada.

Marquette University

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople. Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire. By Paul J. Alexander. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1958. Pp. xii, 287. $7.00.)

Nicephorus I (✠ 828) played a leading rôle in one of the gravest crises in the history of the Church, and especially of its Byzantine province in which he was a ranking prelate. This book, accordingly, develops, in part contrapuntally, as it were, two main themes: the crisis and the man; Chapters III-VIII dealing with the Patriarch and I, II, V, VI—perhaps more sketchily than might be desired—with the iconoclastic controversy and its antecedents. Nicephorus' literary activity and iconophile ideas are adequately dealt with in Chapters VII and VIII, and Chapter IX presents the conclusions of this well written and attractively produced book. The crisis-theme contains one recurrent motif: the paradox, to which the author calls our attention, of the iconophiles' resorting to the arguments once used by intellectual pagans in defense of their idolatry from the attacks of the early Christian apologists, and of the iconoclasts' repeating the aniconic postulates of the O.T. and the apologists (e.g., pp. 9, 23, 35, 37, 39, 53, 214-217). In actual fact, however, when all the necessary distinctions have been made, the problem will appear somewhat more complex and far less paradoxical. In the world that Christianity had to face two opposite attitudes toward religious art were prevalent. We may call them "ultra-iconic" and "aniconic." On the one hand, there were the pagan eagerness for hierophanies, or theophanies, and too-frequent "attempts to prefigure the mystery of the Incarnation" [M. Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (New York, 1958), p. 30 n. 1; cf. pp. 1-30]. The pagan dialectic of hierophanies admitted of a plethora of *res sacrae,* including cult statues, and its imprecision allowed a variety of theological interpretations. The popular interpretation was one of absolute idolatry, a fetishist identification of idol and divinity; while the more intellectual pagans either tended to believe in a relative identity of image and prototype, a participation of the one in the essence of the other, or, under the impact of the Christian attacks (it would seem), adopted the view that the idols were mere symbols, or representations, of gods and the honors paid to them relative in nature and "referred" to the others. It is solely with the intellectualist views that Alexander is concerned (e.g., pp. 23-30). The opposite attitude was implied, though not necessarily always formulated, in dualistic religious trends which postulated the absolute divorce of spirit, alone good, and wholly evil matter. It was formulated in the O.T.—but for different reasons. The idolatry of the pagans was denounced because of the falsity of their gods, and its intrinsic wickedness and the representation of the true God was prohibited in order to stress His pure spirituality and transcendence in the face of the facile hierophanies of paganism, while in both cases there was the need to stave off the seductions of the neighboring cults. However, this attitude was never strictly adhered to. The Gnostics and the Manichaeans resorted to religious representation, and so also the Jews, as witness the images of the Cherubim in the Temple (*Exodus* 25.18-22; 37.7-8; *Numbers* 7.89; 3 *Kgs.* 6.23-29, cf. 36; 2 *Pa.* 3.7, 10-13; 5.7-8) and the paintings in the Roman catacombs and at Dura-Europos.

A wholly new attitude, equally remote from the other two, was inherent in Christianity. The Incarnation made God visible to man, hence religious truths might be represented in art; the Incarnation was a unique historical event, hence it could not be expected anywhere else: no image could participate in the divine essence, let alone incarnate divinity. This attitude may not have been formulated from the start; on the other hand, the recent Jewish past of some, and the recent pagan past of other Christians—and the seductions of the pagan milieu—called for caution, even occasional opposition (Elvira), of the kind, precisely, that had in part inspired the Jewish (partial) anicony. It is hardly saying enough to remark: "from the Synagogue the Early Church inherited its hostility to religious art, which both identified with paganism. The Christian apologists of the second and third centuries . . . attacked the cult statues of the pagans roughly on the same grounds as the great Hebrew prophets had done a millennium earlier: the statues consist of matter and are made and unmade by human hands" (p. 214). I do not think that the objection to religious art (man-made material objects illustrating religious facts) can be said to have been the real basis for the Jewish and Christian attacks on idolatry. It has just been mentioned (but not by Alexander) that the Jews, while abhorring any representation of God, did have some religious art (even depicting spiritual creatures); and Christian religious art began flourishing in the Roman catacombs and at Dura-Europos precisely at the epoch of the apologists. The fact that the Church sanctioned it at its very center far outweighs the frowning of this or that early writer or the decision of this or that local council. The attacks of the apologists, e.g., Justin Martyr and Athenagoras, like the basic prohibition of the O.T., were grounded (as Alexander fails to recognize) in the *falsity* of the pagan gods; they dealt with idolatry and not religious art as such. In summing up the argument of Athenagoras' *Supplicatio* ((pp. 25-26), "the most elaborate source for pagan and early Christian views on religious images," Alexander juxtaposes the Apologist's insistence on the idols' man-made and material character with his rejection of the theory of symbolic representation, proffered by some intellectual pagans, "which [adds Alexander] was to serve later as a defense for Christian images." The impression created, perhaps unwittingly, is that the above insistence is the basis for the rejection of the above theory: the early apologist is pitted against Christian images. This will not, however, be borne out by the text of Athenagoras. In it, he argues against *two* varieties of idolatry. First, against the popular, "fetishist," and most widespread form; this he does by showing the man-made, material character of idols. Next (Chapter XVIII), he takes up the more rarefied symbolic theory and rejects it, not because of itself, but because of the falsity, if not even the diabolical inspiration, of polytheism (*ibid.*, pp. xix, xx, beginning of xxiii). That the falsity of the prototypes and, of course, idolatry, rather than the legitimacy of religious illustrations, were in question with the early Christians, is also clear from St. Paul, in I *Corinthians* 8.4-6; 10.19; and 10.20-21 (another reference missed in the book).

As paganism waned and the Church rose to triumph, its caution diminished. What followed has appeared to nineteenth-century minds, like J. B. Bury's, as a "pagan transmutation of Christianity" (p. 4); in reality, it was the exact opposite. Surer now of the faith of its members, the Church—the reality which fulfilled the adumbrations of old, as Origen might have said—could freely Christianize that which was not so much pagan as simply part and parcel of the all-human pattern of religious expression; hence, indeed, "incense, lights, flowers, the cult of martyrs, of saints, and of images" (*ibid.*). Thus Christian religious art acquired a double function: not only to instruct, in monumental compositions, but also to evoke veneration to be "referred" to whom it symbolized or depicted, in the *relative cult* of the cross, the images (icons), as well as relics. This has had the official sanction of the Church to this day. Whether the formulation of this attitude was (as is impossible to demonstrate) or was not influenced by that of the symbolic theory of some pagans is immaterial. But all this is not to say that the official attitude of the Church was followed by all of its members. Here another distinction, far too often overlooked, is to be stressed, between the Church as an organic and hierarchical institution and any of its parts, whether individual members (like Eusebius of Caesarea) or separate provinces, e.g., Byzantium. There did, in fact, occur a certain "pagan transmutation of Christianity" in some quarters of Christian society; but not in the sense of indifferent details taken over and adapted to Christian use (which so shocked or delighted the nineteenth century), but in the sense of the retention of a pagan psychology, the often unformulated postulates of which went counter to the basic tenets of Christianity. This retention did, indeed, tend to transmute large sections of Byzantine Christianity, hemmed as it was within the surviving framework of the Roman polity and Hellenistic civilization.

The survival of the pre-Christian attitude to the correlation of polity and religion, in Byzantine Caesaro-centrism, and of the pre-Christian conception of a subjectively-universal and divine State, in Byzantine theophanic microcosmism, has already been commented on in this journal (XL, 411-429; XLIV, 336-342). The iconoclastic controversy bears witness to another survival, of the two pre-Christian attitudes toward religious images, and to the oblivion of the Christian one. Space limitation will not allow me to speak of this in any detail. Suffice it to say that the iconoclasts represented the old aniconic trend that had found adherents in some early Christians and been subsequently much reinforced by Manichaean, Monophysitic, Jewish, and Muslim influences and by considerations of a secular nature; while the iconophiles represented, not only the vanishing Christian view, but also, and especially, the "ultra-iconic" trend of old. This latter trend with the masses verged on idolatry, or iconolatry, the icons assuming a sacramental character and, in fact, "competing with the sacraments" (p. 102). With the intellectuals it expressed itself, under the impact of pseudo-Dionysian, neo-Platonic, and Platonic ideas, in arguments that gravitated, with their insistence on the necessary nature of images and their potential inclusion in the prototypes, toward the relative idolatry of the pagans; it also defended itself, rather confusedly, in scholastic terms borrowed from the Aristotelian tradition. Nicephorus was an exponent of this Byzantine iconophile scholasticism, and it is Alexander's particular merit to draw our attention to this fact.

It would be difficult to maintain with Alexander that the argument of the iconoclasts repeated that of the early apologists against idolatry, because the former could not possibly, like the latter, assert the falsity of the prototypes. This, I believe, rather disposes of the "paradox" mentioned earlier. There was, however, a true paradox in that the iconoclasts fought not the traditional Christian view of symbolic representation (both instructive and devotional), but the exaggerations of the Byzantines. Thus the celebrated, if somewhat muddled, Christological argument of Constantine V (pp. 48-53, 218-219) had any sense at all only because this greatest of the iconoclasts used as his premise the relative idolatry of his opponents. Faced with the Catholic theory of images, Constantine's "dilemma" would have remained hornless. Needless to add, the result of the utter difference between the Catholic view and the two Byzantine exaggerations was that the Holy See, and the West in general, appear to have never quite understood the significance of the controversy; and, moreover, that the victory of the iconophiles at the end of it contributed, probably no less than that of the iconoclasts would have done, to the final religious separation of the Byzantine province from Rome.

In this connection, the differences between eastern and western religiosity (pp. 101-102, based on Harnack) are not, perhaps, very felicitously presented. What it can mean is only a difference between external and internal religiosity. The "fear of sin" in western religiosity is surely the emphasis laid upon individual conscience. Salvation after death and life of grace (unmentioned here) are not external and automatic, but internal and contingent on man's wholehearted response to God. It is thus a matter of will, not only of intellect, and not at all of imagination. This is surely the Christian view. It can be called western only negatively, because the East tended away from it. In the East there was, indeed, a tendency to automaticity and externalism. The splendid ecclesiastical ceremonial, borrowed so lavishly from Caesar's palace, was *felt* to be a foretaste, almost a guarantee, of heaven, and like the icon and the empire itself, the necessary and *exact* reflexion of it—a "theatrical theophanism." This externalism and this consciencelessness run like a red thread through Byzantine history, a striking contrast to the West and still another survival of pre-Christian times.

For the rest, Gerhardt Ladner's brilliant study on the "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy" [*Mediaeval Studies,* 2 (1940), 127-149] has not been superseded by Alexander's treatment of the crisis-theme. Ladner, moreover, went deeper, to the basic reasons for the imperial support of iconoclasm.

CYRIL TOUMANOFF

Georgetown University

Warriors of God: The Great Religious Orders and Their Founders. By Walter Nigg. Edited and translated by Mary Ilford from the German. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1959. Pp. viii, 353, xvi. $6.95.)

This is a pleasing book, well written, admirably translated, splendidly illustrated and produced. Mr. Nigg, a Protestant minister and associate professor in the University of Zurich, aims to present the history and spirit of monasticism and to show that it is an institution vitally needed to rejuvenate the world today. He sets the stage in an excellent introduction and illustrates his theme with the lives of eleven monastic founders, beginning with St. Anthony the Hermit and running the gamut through SS. Pachomius, Basil, Augustine, Benedict, Bruno, Bernard, Francis, Dominic, and Teresa (the only female representative), to St. Ignatius. He uses these lives as vehicles for much penetrating comment concerning the genius of monasticism, often lifting the veil to let us see its inner spirit. The book is peppered with penetrating statements—almost aphoristic at times—that delight the reader with their insight.

The title of the work in the original language: *Vom Geheimnis der Moenche,* expresses its scope better than the English title and sub-title, for though Mr. Nigg does briefly review the history of the orders founded by his "warriors," yet this treatment is weak; necessarily so, since no one can adequately describe the achievements of a dozen orders in one volume. The sketches consequently are his impression of what is significant in the story of each order rather than an adequate summary. With the Dominicans he devotes a bare half page to all their history subsequent to the death of Savonarola, yet gives two full pages to that friar's tragic story. Naïvely, too, he implies that all the order's subsequent misfortunes, during the Protestant Revolt, the Enlightenment, and the Napoleonic Era were due to its failure to learn the lesson of Savonarola's tragedy.

Mr. Nigg's sketch of St. Dominic, though splendid in presenting the true significance of his work in restoring preaching to its rightful place, in emphasizing study as a necessary prelude to preaching, in choosing poverty for its ascetic and apostolic value, is quite unsatisfactory in detail and emphasis. Unfortunately, he elected to follow Scheeben's *Der heilige Dominikus* without balancing it against the work of Mandonnet and Vicaire. Thomists will object to considering Aquinas merely a philosopher, will deny that he has nothing important to offer in the resolution of the "newer, specifically modern problems," and Dominican Thomists, that they but parrot their master. Dominicans in general will reject the implication that their order is failing the Church and souls today. They will raise their eyebrows when they learn that Meister Eckhart is "the third great figure of the Order," next to Dominic and Aquinas. No Catholic will agree that the condemnation of Eckhart's propositions by the pope was "a most regrettable step," even though they are aware that his errors were honest errors made through "rashness of language," and not with an obstinate heart or a beclouded intellect. The Church must defend the truth even against the most noble.

Nevertheless, an excellent book is not spoiled by such blemishes. All readers will like its warmth, its deep sympathy for monasticism, its grasp of the monastic spirit, its kindliness, its avoidance of the sterile, scientific approach that debunks the men whose story it claims to tell. Mr. Nigg's approach to the inner meaning of the miraculous and the extraordinary is, perhaps, best represented by his own remark: "Nor is there any reason, merely because a tale is strange, to reject it out of hand; it should rather be accepted as the timeless symbol that it is. And if we so accept it, we shall find ourselves ushered into the grandiose world of early monasticism. . . ."

WILLIAM A. HINNEBUSCH

Dominican House of Studies
Washington

St. Odo of Cluny. Being the Life of St. Odo of Cluny by John of Salerno and the Life of St. Gerald of Aurillac by St. Odo. Edited and translated by Gerard Sitwell, O.S.B. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1959. Pp. xxix, 186. $4.50.)

In this volume Dom Gerard Sitwell has edited and translated two documents which are of great value to the history of Christendom. In the depths of the darkness which descended upon Europe in the tenth century, there were found the first faint traces of the light which was to shine forth upon Europe in a new Christian civilization. While the remnants of the old Carolingian Empire were being engulfed by the violence of internal anarchy and Northman invasion, men stamped with Christian heroism were resisting the flood of barbarism and were trying to reverse the tide by applying Christian principles to their society. The fact that they were able to resist the disintegration and make significant forward progress along the road of civilization puts all of us in their debt.

The life of St. Odo of Cluny included here was written by John of Salerno who knew Odo well and personally witnessed many of the events which he records. Odo was the second abbot of the great monastery of Cluny, and under him was formed the spirit which had such tremendous influence on contemporary monasticism and on the whole Church. Dom Sitwell says: "Indeed it would be true to say that the influence for monastic reform associted with Cluny in its early days was in reality the personal influence of Odo." Although miraculous events have a prominent place in this life as they do in all mediaeval hagiography, John is more interested in portraying the virtues of Odo and in them he finds the saint's true greatness and the source of his influence on his age.

St. Gerald of Aurillac is a lesser known figure and St. Odo's life is our only source of information about him. In Gerald we have an example of a holy layman who obviously had a great effect on his contemporaries. Although this life is inferior to John's life of Odo, it does present a valuable portrait of a feudal lord living an intense religious life outside of a monastery.

Both of these biographies are important for the history of religious life during the tenth century, but they also help to make us realize much more clearly the social and political character of this age of violence. This volume is a worthy addition to the Makers of Christendom Series under the general editorship of Christopher Dawson.

Gerard J. Campbell

Loyola College
Baltimore

The Great Chartulary of Glastonbury. Volumes I, II, and III. Edited by Dom Aelred Watkin. [Somerset Record Society, Volumes LIX, LXIII, and LXIV.] (Frome, Somerset: Butler & Tanner, Ltd. 1947, 1952, 1956. Pp. xviii, 248; cxciii, 575; ccxlvi, 794.) [Available from Mrs. S. W. Rawlins, 19 Kensington Hall Gardens, London, W. 14.]

Some future historian of the Abbey of Glastonbury will, indeed, be grateful to Dom Aelred Watkin for the time and care he has lavished on the edition of the *Great Chartulary* of that monastery. From the monastic medley of legal, economic, and topographical documents here presented, the abbey's life *ad extra,* its relationship to civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and to its dependents are clearly revealed. The three volumes of this edition—appearing in 1947, 1952, and 1956—reflect the original documents preserved in the Glastonbury archives down to 1340. The chartulary is a fourteenth-century manuscript of 244 folios now in the library of the Marquess of Bath at Longleat. It was composed probably between 1338 and 1340, and gives a good picture of this monastic establishment almost on the eve of the Black Death. Less famous than the *Secretum Domini* (Bodleian, MS. Wood Empt. I), another chartulary of Glastonbury, it is, nevertheless, more important in that it served as the model from which the *Secretum* was copied. Unfortunately, Dom Aelred was unable to collate the latter with his manuscript until after the first volume had gone to press, and he was thus prevented from clearing up several doubtful readings. Cross-references to the *Secretum,* however, are given throughout.

In all, the three volumes contain 1335 documents (I: 1-391; II: 392-1061; III: 1062-1335), with 246 pages of descriptive analysis. It is somewhat disconcerting to follow the Roman and arabic pagination which runs consecutively through all three volumes; but the effort is rewarding, especially in the section devoted to *analyse,* which is cleverly done. The first volume deals with documents of a more general nature, those which concern Glastonbury as a whole; the second contains deeds connected with the abbey manors and hundreds in the County of Somerset; the final volume includes materials on Glastonbury properties in Devonshire, Dorset, Wiltshire, and Berkshire, and concludes with an interesting series of agreements between the Abbots of Glastonbury and their convent. The usefulness of the edition is enhanced by an *index locorum,* arranged by counties, and an *index nominum,* which together cover every person or place appearing in the chartulary. A list of *errata* (p. 783) for Volumes I-II reflects the revisionary care of the editor and his critics.

No short notice can possibly reflect the flavor of the quaint, the bizarre, and of the commonplace which at times stand side by side within the chartulary. No. 172, a "Record Concerning Uffeculme," in Devon, dated for *ca.* 1075-1080, is, perhaps, the most precious gem in the collection. It relates the history of this vill, mentioned in Domesday Book, unjustly held by Walter de Doway, whose first wife, Edith, had promised to return the land to the abbey at her death. "Providentially" struck down by serious illness, Walter promised to become a monk, was clothed with the habit, and received the tonsure. But to the dismay of the monks, Walter recovered; his (second) wife and friends dressed him again in his own clothes, and Glastonbury was deprived of its legal claim.

Only enthusiasm, perhaps, will lead a scholar to delve into the minutiae involved in editing the "dry bones" of a monastic chartulary. But Dom Aelred has caught the spirit of the Westlands, and through his effort the *Great Chartulary of Glastonbury* will remain "from age to age a lasting witness and an abiding memory."

Owen J. Blum

Quincy College

Jacopo Sadoleto, 1477-1547. Humanist and Reformer. By Richard M. Douglas. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1959. Pp. xvi, 307. $5.00).

Most appropriately done in a modern recutting of a type named after Jacopo Sadoleto's friend, Cardinal Pietro Bembo, and originally used in the publication of Bembo's *De Aetna,* this volume is an excellent portrayal of one of the leading Catholic churchmen during the lifetime of Martin Luther. In one way or another Sadoleto was in personal touch with most of the major problems and movements of his day. As one of the best Latinists of the age he had entree to Renaissance literary circles; as secretary in the papal curia he was close to the formation of Vatican policy; as probably the closest Italian friend of Erasmus he was in touch with the position that learning was the key to European peace; as bishop and cardinal he shared the burden of reform and conciliar preparations; as papal delegate he received insight into the intensity of the Hapsburg-Valois rivalry. Mr. Douglas describes all these phases of Sadoleto's life with a sureness and breadth that is the result of intimate acquaintance with the source material, including some hitherto unused documents in the Vatican Archives and in the archives of Provence.

A striking feature of this work is its depiction of the perennial prevalence of mighty tensions both in Sadoleto's personal life and in the world in which he lived. Sadoleto felt keenly the interior conflict between the *vita negotiosa,* which he abhorred, and the *vita contemplativa* for which he pined. Convinced of the power of Europe's literary community to ease the religious disputes in Germany, he wrote irenic letters to Melancthon and Sturm, only to incur the indignation of the conservatives like Johann Dobneck, Johann Eck, and Friedrich Nausea. He was in the midst of the strained relations created by the differences among Catholics on the question of justification and by the diverse attitudes within the College of Cardinals of such men as Contarini and Caraffa. It is carefully detailed studies of this kind that will demolish at least some of the hoary generalizations about the Catholic Reform.

In a style that is serene, lucid, and dignified Mr. Douglas pronounces judgments that are marked by balance and comprehensiveness. For example, he recognizes in Sadoleto "a humanist with irenic concern but without the curialist's sensitivity to papal politics and dynastic interests"; a member of the commission on conciliar affairs than whom there was none "less partisan, less attached to national interest, or more independent of the Pope's dynastic wishes." He candidly points to Sadoleto's ineptitude in the practical quest for Christian peace because "he seldom disciplined himself, whether as moralist or diplomat, to think in terms of the feasible. His concern was usually with what the princes should do rather than with what could actually be expected from them." As for the cardinal's constant search for scholarly leisure, Mr. Douglas maintains that Sadoleto "seemed unwilling to admit that he was not free to define his vocation in the Church with perfect liberty . . ." With its fine bibliography and notes this volume is a most laudable piece of historical research and writing.

William V. Bangert

St. Andrew-on-Hudson
Poughkeepsie

Der Josephinismus. Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Oesterreich, 1760-1850; I. Band: *Ursprung und Wesen des Josephinismus, 1760-1769;* II. Band: *Entfaltung und Krise des Josephinismus, 1770-1790;* III. Band: *Das Werk des Hofrats Heinke, 1768-1790;* IV. Band: *Der Spätjosephinismus, 1790-1820.* By Ferdinand Maass, S.J. (Wien: Verlag Herold. 1951-1957. Pp. xxiii, 395; xxxi, 559; xi, 498; xxiv, 667.)

The problem of Josephinism has received considerable attention from historians in recent years, and these writings are surveyed in the introduction to the first of the volumes here under review. However, all the studies pertaining to the problem will need revision as a result of the monumental work of Father Maass. Four volumes have so far been published, comprising the period from 1760 to 1820, and a fifth, coming down to 1850, is in preparation and will conclude the work. These volumes are based for the most part on unpublished documents from Austrian archives the relevance of which justify the statement that they are a landmark not only in the history of Josephinism, but in the history of the Enlightenment in general.

To Maass, Josephinism is a new philosophy of the relations between Church and State that reaches back to the middle of the eighteenth century when the wars against Prussia endangered the very existence of the Habsburg Empire and required the Austrian statesmen to make use of every means to strengthen their faltering country. "If Kaunitz (the chancellor of Austria) is the father of Josephinism, Maria Theresa certainly is its mother," the author wrote in a previous article. He does not hold that the empress called forth such a policy on purpose, but that she acted without thinking clearly; she made no effort to analyze the principles upon which the actions of her chancellor rested.

Josephinism, to Father Maass, was "the deadly threat to Catholicism in Austria"; it was "the brutal violation (of the Church) by the State." He sees it linked up with the general intellectual trends of the period, especially with the tenets of the doctrine of the Enlightenment concerning natural law. Earlier historians had referred to Kaunitz' rationalistic approach; for Maass the chancellor represents the destiny of the Church in Austria (I, 20). Some of the documents published in these volumes depict Kaunitz' mind in a most impressive way. The Josephinistic system developed first in Lombardy where it was well established by 1769. Maass' first volume is devoted to the discussion of this period. When Rome invoked rights well established by treaties and agreements, Kaunitz' answer pointed to the necessities of the State and thus two antagonistic political philosophies clashed. The decisions and the actions of the chancellor sprang from the concept of the unlimited sovereignty of the State and more and more he and his aides succeeded in drawing the pious empress over to his side. Lombardy was considered to be the stronghold of Josephinism as late as the time of Pius IX. Of special interest in Volume I is the last chapter which contains an anonymous treatise of Kaunitz presenting his political philosophy (I, 335-384).

Volume II contains the documents that show how the principles of Josephinism spread from Lombardy all over the empire. As a consequence of the principle of the unlimited sovereignty of the State in all the provinces, restrictions were imposed on the rights of the religious communities, such as the privilege of granting asylum, the right of disposing of ecclesiastical property, etc. Those restrictions came not as a result of negotiations with Rome, but were imposed by the political authorities on the basis of the omnipotence of the State. The chancellor made efforts to strengthen the position of the bishops in order to win their support in his struggle against the centralizing tendencies of Rome; seen from this angle, the policy of Pius IX which culminated in the decrees of the Vatican Council appears as a counter-attack against the trends of Josephinism.

The third volume discusses the work of the counsellor at the imperial court, Franz Joseph Heinke (1726-1803). Maass analyzes the important part assigned to Heinke in developing and defending Josephinism. The counsellor was the expert in ecclesiastical affairs during these decisive decades and on his memoranda and treatises rested the decisions that aimed at a complete rationalization of the Church. Only in strictly spiritual matters, according to Heinke, should the Church be granted any independence from the authority of the State. He likewise insisted on restricting the number of the cardinals and of all papal dignitaries within the Habsburg Empire, maintaining that priests honored in this way would always be more intent on the defense of Rome than on upholding the laws of their country (III, 373 f.).

Volume IV embraces the period of late Josephinism, 1790-1820. The reviewer feels that the Emperors Joseph II and Francis I appear in the presentation of Professor Maass in, as it were, a more favorable light concerning their relations with the Church than their predecessors. The characterization of Francis is largely built upon the well known volume of W. Consuelo Langsam *Francis the Good* (New York, 1949). While Francis did not rid himself of the tenets of Josephinism, his decisions and decrees afford evidence of his having taken a new approach as early as in 1802 (IV, 51, 299 ff.). The position of and the rights accorded to the Apostolic Nuncio at Vienna was to raise serious difficulties under Francis Joseph: witness the crises at the time of Monsignor Agliardi that brought about the resignation of the foreign minister, and the conflict with Monsignor Belmont in connection with the trouble over Professor Wahrmund. In a similar way Monsignor Gabriel Severoli as nuncio was made the object of passionate attacks in 1803 and 1804, and Cardinal Consalvi tried in vain to come to his defense (IV, 52 ff.).

The relations of Prince Metternich with the court of Rome are of special interest. The Austrian chancellor under Francis the Good is usually studied in his later period; in the pages of Maass dealing with the years around 1809 Metternich's mind is seen to be more flexible and, if compared to Kaunitz or Leopold II, one cannot but realize how much more effort Metternich made to keep on good terms with the Holy See. The motives for such an attitude, as far as they are discussed by Maass, were sociopolitical. The instructions the prince gave to his ambassador at the court of Pius VII provide revealing reading to all interested in a study of Metternich's mind (IV, 124 ff.; 578-586). They show the contrast that existed between the concepts of the chancellor and those of some of the other ministers of Francis who belonged to the old tradition. Students of the Risorgimento are familiar with the crisis that developed in the course of the Austrian occupation of Ferrara in the early years of Pius VII. In his instructions of May, 1817, the chancellor offered to order the troops back from Ferrara and Comacchio if the pope would, in return, dispense the bishops of Lombardy from the obligation to go to Rome to receive the papal confirmation, a journey required of all bishops throughout Italy. While no agreement was reached on this point as far as principle was concerned—as happened repeatedly and especially under Cardinal Consalvi—there was a good prospect that a *modus vivendi* would be established with the Roman Curia. The period discussed in the fourth volume comes to a close with the memorandum that Pius VII sent to Emperor Francis in 1819, wherein the pope gave a survey of the doctrines presented at the universities and colleges of Austria which he considered incompatible with the teaching of the Church (IV, 631 ff.). Although the memorandum is extant in only a fragmentary form, it reads like—and actually it is—the papal condemnation of the principles known as Josephinism.

FRIEDRICH ENGEL-JANOSI

University of Vienna

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The REVIEW regrets to announce that by reason of the pressure of other duties Alfred C. Rush, C.SS.R., has felt compelled to resign his associate editorship. Robert F. Trisco, of whose appointment to the history faculty of the Catholic University of America we spoke in our last issue, will take over the work of Father Rush in editing the Notes and Comments and Periodical Literature.

During the last few months three bulletins have appeared appraising the latest advances made in the history of the early Church. One by Jean Daniélou, S.J., is a useful guide into investigations made of Judeo-Christianity, the effects of Platonism on the thinking of some of the early Fathers, etc. He also includes some heretofore unedited texts from the fourth century. ["Bulletin d'Histoire des Origines chrétiennes," *Recherches de Science Religieuse,* 47 (January-March, 1959), 63-124.] Martin R. P. McGuire, associate editor of this REVIEW, extends his study into the first years of the seventh century with helpful summaries of new research and interpretations arranged under topical headings. ["The History of the Church from Pentecost to 604: A Survey of Research, 1954-1958," *Theological Studies,* 20 (March, 1959), 82-107.] Pertinent new solutions and meanings, stimulated by the modern critico-historical approach to theology, are discussed by Herbert Musurillo, S.J. ["New Horizons in Patristic Theology: A Survey of Recent Work," *Traditio,* 14 (1958), 33-61.]

Under the editorship of the Benedictine scholars, L. C. Mohlberg, L. Eizenhoefer, and P. Siffrin, the Herder house in Rome has begun the publishing of an important series of ancient liturgical texts with the general title of *Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, series maior, fontes.* The three volumes thus far available, in order of appearance, are *Sacramentarium Veronense* [*Fontes,* I (1956), cxv, 453], *Missale Francorum* [*Fontes,* II (1957), xxvi, 107], and *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* [*Fontes,* III (1958), xxv, 166]. Of equal significance is the edition by A. Chavasse of *Le sacramentaire gélasien* from the Codex Vat. Reg. 316 (Paris: Desclée, 1958, pp. xxxix, 817).

Bengt Ingmar Kilstroem's *Den kateketiska undervisningen i Sverige under medeltiden* [Catechetical Instruction in Sweden during the Middle Ages] (Lund: Gleerup, 1958, pp. 342) contains much that is highly favorable to the mediaeval Swedish Church. There is a digest of the book's conclusions in *Ephemerides Liturgicae,* 73 (1959), 152-154.

The current issue of the *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* [43 (1957)] is devoted to studies on the Abbey of Saint Germain-des-Prés in Paris and the Benedictine Congregation of Saint Maur on the occasion of the celebration of the abbey's fourteenth centenary held at the Institut Catholique on June 11, 1958.

The writings of John Gerson are an outstanding witness to the thought of early fifteenth-century Europe. They reveal the strong conciliar feeling at the Council of Constance, the mysticism that grew out of the *devotio moderna,* and the complicated politics resulting from the Hundred Years War. Recently three more works of the *doctor christianissimus* have received critical probing. Dorothy G. Wayman, through the discovery of a 1484 copy of the *De quadam puella* in 1956, concludes that this is a genuine tractate of Gerson and should be accepted in place of the *De mirabili victoria,* a political substitution appearing at that time and generally accepted today as his composition. She has transcribed both treatises for an interesting comparative study that leads us to believe that Gerson judged Jeanne "a maid of good life inspired by God," notwithstanding the political pressures in mediaeval France. ["The Chancellor and Jeanne d'arc, February-July, 1429," *Franciscan Studies,* 17 (1957), 273-305.] André Combes has collated sixty-seven manuscripts of the *de mystica theologia* and edited it anew with convincing proof that it comes from the pen of Gerson, and not as sometimes believed, of Pierre d'Ailly. [*Joannes Carlerii de Gerson, De mystica theologia* (Lugano: Thesaurus Mundi, 1958), pp. xxxii, 251.] Gerson's important tract, *De auctoritate Concilii,* is also presented in a critical edition by Z. Reuger. ["Le 'De auctoritate Concilii' de Gerson," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique,* 53 (1958), 775-795.]

During August and September, 1958, Paul Oskar Kristeller visited eastern Europe in search of uncatalogued Renaissance manuscripts. He is preparing what will be an impressive and useful bibliography, soon to be published, of printed and handwritten specimens of Latin manuscripts relating to the Renaissance. He reports on the generous help received from the librarians in Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and Russia, and their eagerness to arrange book exchanges with western European and American libraries. The sources he found were rich, and in some cases supplementing those in western collections. In one instance he discovered a complete copy of *De magia naturali* of Jacobus Faber Stapulensis that will fill out the damaged, partly illegible one in our possession. In spite of the losses and dislocations resulting from World War II, the manuscripts are carefully preserved and available. ["Renaissance Manuscripts in Eastern Europe," *Renaissance News,* 12 (Summer, 1959), 83-90.]

Francesco Pacelli's recent volume, *Il Diario della conciliazione* (Libreria Vaticana), which provides rich details concerning the negotiation of the Lateran treaties between the Holy See and Italy in 1929, is the subject of B. Schneider's article, "Das Tagebuch des Francesco Pacelli," in *Stimmen der Zeit,* 164 (May, 1959), 81-97. The Pacelli work will be reviewed in a later issue of the REVIEW.

President Truman's efforts in the spring of 1948 to set in motion through the late Myron Taylor negotiations among Christian churchmen are described by Robert Pell, who took part in the project, in "An Appeal for Christian Unity," in *America* of May 30, 1959.

The June 15 issue of *Orientierung,* a biweekly journal of the Swiss Jesuits, carries an article written by one who signs himself "Felix Lektor" that will be of interest to historians. It is by way of a reply to an essay of Professor Albert Sleumer which served as a preface to the German translation of the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum.* "Felix Lektor" finds the Sleumer essay much too rigid in tone. After sketching the historical background for the *Index,* citing examples of lifting the ban on certain books, and contrasting the total number of books condemned in various periods (1,358 in the nineteenth century as compared to only 298 in the present century), he then raises the question of the future of the *Index.* "Felix Lektor" asks if it might not be well to consider either abolishing the *Index* entirely as impossible of enforcement and admitting of no chance for its activities to be carried out in a just, conclusive, and sensible manner, or to have it undergo a radical revision. The latter, as the author sees it, would embrace such points as removing material of an obsolete character, providing a greater leeway for new ideas, making it a requirement that before a book is condemned the author's bishop must be consulted, granting to the author a full hearing, making fully known the reasons for the condemnation, and establishing a more liberal policy regarding dispensations for reading books on the *Index.* On the last point John J. Reed, S.J., of Woodstock College had an article in *Theological Studies* ["Permission to Read Prohibited Books," XIX (December, 1958), 586-595] the principal emphasis of which was these dispensations. Father Reed suggested the desirability of a more generous and efficient policy governing these permissions and he mentioned that this might be done with greater despatch and less bother to the bishop if faculties were granted to confessors so that the latter could dispense from the rules when they thought there was just cause. The entire subject is of more than ordinary timeliness since it may well become a topic for discussion and legislation in the forthcoming ecumenical council.

The summer number of the *Yale Review* carried a perceptive article by Robert D. Cross, associate professor of history in Swarthmore College, entitled "The Changing Image of Catholicism in America." The colonial image of the Church is traced from the days of Paul Dudley's benefaction to Harvard College in 1750 with its provision for a lecture on the evils of Catholicism through the nineteenth-century nativist turmoil, the Gilded Age, and on down to the greatly altered concept of Catholicism held today by American non-Catholics. In summarizing his findings the author concludes, "Catholicism has at last become a part of American culture" (p. 575). Mr. Cross will be remembered by our readers for his excellent book, *The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America* (Cambridge, 1958), which won honorable mention last year for the John H. Dunning Prize of the American Historical Association.

The August-September number of *Worship* has been arranged as a special "Reunion Issue." All the major articles deal with a discussion of ecumenical problems in terms of our Lord's eucharistic prayer "That they may be one. . . ." Such topics as "Islam and Christian Unity," "The Latin Liturgy our Bond with Eastern Rites," "Liturgy on the Eve of the Reformation," and "The Sixteenth Century" receive particular treatment.

The doctoral dissertation of Mother Mary Peter Carthy, O.S.U., President of the College of New Rochelle, "English Influences on Early American Catholicism," which was submitted originally to the Catholic University of America is published in Volume XLVI (1958) of *Historical Records and Studies* (pp. 12-149). The story is carried from the earliest colonial contacts between the two groups of English-speaking Catholics down to 1852, the year that the American bishops assembled in Baltimore (May) for their First Plenary Council and the English bishops met at Oscott (July) for the First Provincial Synod of Westminster. The annual volume of the United States Catholic Historical Society also contains the paper, "The New Prometheus: Visual Glory in a Democratic Society," of Henry Hope Reed, Jr., read at the annual meeting on October 29, 1957 (pp. 3-11).

On November 24, 1859, the first edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species* appeared in publication. To commemorate the Darwin centennial year, *Thought* has included four interesting articles in its summer issue that assess his influence in biology, philosophy, theology, and the general thinking of Americans.

A new quarterly journal of history appeared in June with the title *Arizona and the West,* published by the University of Arizona Press at Tucson and edited by John Alexander Carroll. The initial number features articles on the frontier by John W. Caughey and Walter Rundell, Jr., and of special interest to readers of the REVIEW is the attention given to the career of Fray Pedro Antonio de Arriquibar, O.F.M., chaplain of the Spanish fort at Tucson at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

* * *

Colorado's celebration this year of the centennial of the "Pike's Peak or Bust" gold rush calls to mind a neglected phase of Catholic history in this country, viz., the prominent part played by a number of lay Catholics in the opening up of the American West. An example is Dennis Sheedy (1846-1923) who was brought to the United States from Ireland at the age of one, the family settling first in Massachusetts and then in 1858 moving to Iowa. It was in Iowa that young Sheedy caught the western fever, and he left his family and started west in May, 1863, at the age of sixteen for the beginning of what proved to be a life of almost fabulous proportions. According to Le Roy R. Hafen, it was a career that "gives him a place in the early history of almost every state west of the Missouri River" (*Dictionary of American Biography,* XVII, 57). Sheedy's business activities ranged all the way from mining and merchandising in Virginia City, Montana Territory, to that of rancher and cattle king in Texas and Nebraska where he owned 32,000 head of cattle and 400 horses when he sold out his stock interests in 1884. He was one of the key figures in the Globe Smelting and Refining Company, and by 1894 he was in control of the Denver Dry Goods Company which under his management became the largest department store between Chicago and San Francisco. The bare outline of his business ventures is contained in a brief memoir which Sheedy wrote a year before his death and which he had privately printed under the title, *The Autobiography of Dennis Sheedy* (Denver, 1922). For almost a half century he was prominently identified with Catholicism in Colorado, and when Francesco Satolli, at the time Pro-Apostolic Delegate and cardinal-designate, visited Denver in March, 1896, with his secretary, the French-born Sulpician, Alexis Orban, Sheedy entertained the visitors. The business methods of Denver's Bishop Nicholas C. Matz were never such as to recommend themselves to a man of Sheedy's acumen, and Orban has an amusing reference to the relationship between the bishop and the millionaire merchant in his account of the dinner which the latter gave in Satolli's honor. He stated: "Mr. Sheedy was a devout Catholic and Bishop Matz considered him to be his best friend. Yet during the course of the meal this gentleman said to His Eminence that as long as Bishop Matz was bishop of Denver he would do nothing for the diocese" ["Tour of His

Eminence Cardinal Francesco Satolli, Pro-Apostolic Delegate, through the United States (of the North) from 12 February to 13 March, 1896," edited by Colman J. Barry, O.S.B., *Historical Records and Studies,* XLIII (1955), 81]. Needless to say, all the Catholics who went west did not meet with the brilliant success of Dennis Sheedy, but a careful search would probably turn up others among these pioneers whose life story would be worth knowing. Nor was the West the only part of the country that had such Catholics. At one time in the early history of Memphis, Tennessee, the richest man in town was Eugene Magevney (1798-1873), an Irish-born school teacher, who by a streak of luck made a fortune in Memphis real estate and was helpful to the early Bishops of Nashville, the Dominicans, Richard P. Miles and James Whalen. The history of the Church in this country has often been too narrowly conceived in purely ecclesiastical terms; the biographies of laymen like Sheedy and Magevney were also part, and an important part, of the American Catholic story and they need to be better known.

The Philadelphia symposium of April 13-14, commemorating the centennial of the death of Alexis de Tocqueville which was mentioned in our April issue (p. 103), drew about thirty scholars for a series of papers and discussions which were conducted before large and appreciative audiences. Among the points of view and conclusions expressed during the sessions were the following: Felix Gilbert of Bryn Mawr College thought it possible to consider de Tocqueville as one of the last representatives of the great classical tradition of historical literature; to Gilbert Chinard and Robert R. Palmer, both of Princeton, as well as to John A. Lukacs of Chestnut Hill College, it does not matter whether de Tocqueville be thought of as an historian or a sociologist since his intellectual achievement transcends both these disciplines. To J. P. Mayer of Princeton the de Tocqueville method bears the marks of the great judicial magistrates of the eighteenth century, although Professor Chinard held that the influences of Pascal and the *moralistes* of the seventeenth century must not be overlooked. To Dr. Lukacs it is possible to ascertain evidences of de Tocqueville's personal religion within certain periods of his life, although apart from these evidences it is—according to Albert Saloman of the New School—indisputable that his philosophy of history remained profoundly Christian throughout. Professor Palmer contrasted de Tocqueville's views of the French aristocracy with the published views of Herve de Tocqueville, his father, while Edward T. Gargan of Loyola University, Chicago, surveyed some of the earlier work of de Tocqueville as an historian. Hans Kohn of City College and Fritz Stern of Columbia University argued for de Tocqueville as a liberal while Russell Kirk spoke for him as a conservative; John J. Kennedy of the University of Notre Dame presented the absolutist political philosophy of de Tocqueville's contemporary, Donoso Cortés. There was general agreement that there has been an extraordinary revival of interest in de Tocqueville a century after his death, and that future problems may turn about the inadequate quality of de Tocqueville studies rather than the inadequacy of their number. To most of the members of the symposium de Tocqueville was greater as an historian than his work and, therefore, in order to understand his vision of history one must first understand de Tocqueville the person.

With a view to highlighting the Festival of the Americas which was held in Chicago during the past summer Loyola University and Mundelein College combined to sponsor a series of five lectures on the general subject, "The Role of the Church in Contemporary Latin America." Among the speakers were Paul S. Lietz, chairman of Loyola's Department of History, W. Eugene Shiels, S.J., who holds the same post at Xavier University, Cincinnati, Luis Gálvez of Quito, Ecuador, Sister Mary Crescentia Thornton, B.V.M., of Mundelein College, and Francis E. McMahon of Chicago.

On July 6-11 Rosemont College and Villanova University sponsored a symposium on Christian culture which was held at the two colleges. Of six sessions, one was dedicated to "Christian Culture and the Study of History." Christopher Dawson participated in the panel discussions, and the consensus of those present seemed to be that the symposium, and particularly the session on the study of history, were highly successful.

A conference on Latin America will be held on the Stanford University campus on October 9-11. The theme of the conference will be "Contemporary Latin America," and included in the proceedings will be a session devoted to religion in Latin America. For this part of the program it is hoped that there will be a panel comprised of spokesmen for the major religious groups.

John A. Mackay will represent the Protestants. It is expected that out of the conference will emerge a book entitled "Latin America Today." The dates selected, October 9-11, were chosen so that the conference might come immediately after the meeting of the Inter-American Press Association in San Francisco and the UNESCO meeting on education in Latin America to be held in Denver. It is planned to hold similar conferences at Stanford University every ten years.

During its 1959 session the Minnesota Legislature appropriated funds for the creation of a new state park, Old Crow Wing, the site of a frontier mission center and a thriving trading post in central Minnesota during the 1850's. It was here that Francis X. Pierz (1785-1880), Carniola-born priest and zealous Chippewa Indian missionary and guide of the immigrant, had his headquarters. Currently under the enthusiastic guidance of the Most Reverend Peter W. Bartholome, Bishop of St. Cloud, fourth degree groups of the Knights of Columbus in the vicinity are engaged in the restoration of the original Catholic church which was located in this historic and scenic setting at the confluence of the Mississippi and Crow Wing Rivers.

The Peter Guilday Prize of $100, offered annually, for the best master's thesis completed in the Department of History of the Catholic University of America, was awarded for 1959 to Sister Mary Elvan Maschmann, O.S.F., for her study entitled "Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Turkey, 1919-1933." Sister Elvan is a member of the faculty of Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee, where she took her A.B. degree in 1953 when the institution was known as St. Clare College.

Paul S. Lietz, chairman of the Department of History of Loyola University, Chicago, has announced that the department has instituted an annual competition for the best master's essay submitted during a given academic year. The entries will be judged by a committee of historians drawn from the faculty of Loyola as well as from other universities, and the essay judged to be the best will be published by the Loyola University Press. The purpose of the William P. Lyons Master's Essay Award, as it is to be called, is to make a positive contribution to the improvement and excellence of the master's essay in American universities. The closing date for entries for the coming academic year is July 15, 1960. For further details graduate students should address Professor Edward T. Gargan, Department of History, Loyola University, Chicago 26, Illinois.

The second annual contest sponsored by *Saint Meinrad Essays* (with prizes of $150, $100, $50) is open to any major seminarian in the United States or Canada. The subject will be confined to ecumenical councils and the essays must not exceed 5,000 words and must be postmarked not later than February 1, 1960. Judges for the contest will be Henry G. J. Beck of Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, Frederick H. Chase of St. John's Seminary, Brighton, and Stephan Kuttner of the Catholic University of America. For further details address *Saint Meinrad Essays,* Saint Meinrad, Indiana.

The Society of American Historians has announced the fourth annual Francis Parkman Prize, a cash award of $500, for a scholarly work of literary distinction in American history written during 1959. Further information may be had from Rudolf A. Clemen, vice president of the society, Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey.

We were glad to have been reminded in the July issue of the *American Historical Review* that September 19 marked the centennial of the birth of J. Franklin Jameson. Our own journal, and the Association of which it is the official organ, owe much to the memory of Dr. Jameson who gave every assistance to Peter Guilday and the other founders at the birth of the Association in 1919, as he had likewise permitted them to benefit from his wisdom and experience at the time that the REVIEW was inaugurated in April, 1915. He was present at the inaugural meeting of the former at Cleveland on December 30, 1919, and spoke in a very encouraging way to the fifty-some members present. Dr. Jameson noted that the American Historical Association had been organized thirty-five years before by, as he said, "a smaller number of people than are now in this room," and it then had (1919) 2,700 or 2,800 members. "I know no reason why in less than thirty-five years the American Catholic Historical Association might not be a body of two or three thousand members." [Peter Guilday, "The American Catholic Historical Association," CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, VI (April, 1920), 6]. With the approximately 1,100 members of the present time we have not altogether lived up to Dr. Jameson's optimism in our regard; but it is pleasant, nonetheless, to record in this centennial year of his birth that during our nearly forty years of life his is the only name that the Association has ever enrolled as an honorary member.

Edward E. Y. Hales, author of *Pio Nono. A Study in European Politics and Religion in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1954) and *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (New York, 1958), is spending the current month on a visit to this country. He will be in Washington for the week of October 11-17 where he will give a lecture on October 14 at the Catholic University of America under the auspices of the Department of History, and on the evening of October 15 he is scheduled to speak to the history faculty and students of Georgetown University.

Charles E. Schrader, S.J., who since 1934 has been head of the Department of History in the University of Detroit, has retired from that post and has been succeeded by Herman J. Muller, S.J. Father Muller received his training at Xavier, Loyola, and Saint Louis University and has been at the University of Detroit since 1956.

Jorge Camargo, S.J., rector of the recently founded University of Córdoba, Argentina, completed in June a visit to a number of United States universities. The universities visited by Father Camargo on a tour conducted under the auspices of the Department of State included Fordham, Marquette, Notre Dame, and Georgetown. The operations of the University of Córdoba are expected to benefit from the new legal structure in Argentina which has eliminated most of the former strictures against religious education.

John J. Kennedy is leaving the University of Notre Dame in February to assume a new position in the Woodrow Wilson Department of Foreign Affairs at the University of Virginia. Dr. Kennedy will teach advanced courses and direct research in Latin American studies.

Marshall Winkler, S.J., a graduate student of William Manger at Georgetown University, has received an OAS Fellowship which will enable him to conduct research in Chile on the contemporary political structure. Father Winkler left for Chile in June.

Alfred J. Bakewicz, who did his graduate work at Marquette and Loyola University, Chicago, died during the past summer at the age of twenty-nine.

BRIEF NOTICES

ARGENTI, PHILIP P. *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese and Their Administration of the Island, 1346-1566.* With a preface by Sir Steven Runciman. Three Volumes. (Cambridge University Press. 1958. Pp. xxiii, 713; xvii, 1-475; 476-981. $50.00.)

These three handsome volumes, bedecked with map, illustrations, and *pièces justificatives* (two volumes full), will raise the envy of historians who, under the exigencies of modern publishing, have had to compress their own cherished sources into cryptic archival references few of their fellows can utilize. But, then, this is the *magnum opus* of a man who knows and loves his native Chios and who has set forth to enable others to know it too. Volume I ("Text") will prove indispensable for the history of Italian colonies in the Levant, for business organization as represented by the Genoese stock company that administered the island (the "Mahona"), and a short chapter (the fifteenth) will interest many readers of this journal for its notices on the relation, in Chios, of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. Volume II contains statutes and charters concerning the Genoese administration, and Volume III, "Notarial Deeds," adds importantly to our growing bibliography of published Genoese notarial acts. Few scholars, or even libraries, will be able to afford the price asked for these volumes, but those few libraries which purchase them may expect, fifty years hence, still to be attracting scholars wanting to consult them. (DAVID HERLIHY)

BIHLMEYER, KARL AND HERMANN TÜCHLE (reviser). Translated by Victor Mills, O.F.M. *Church History.* Volume I. *Christian Antiquity.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1958. Pp. xiii, 437. $8.50.)

This translation of a German work is obviously and emphatically a text book, the first of a three-volume series. As a text for seminarians on the theological level, it appears to be a highly commendable production. This can safely be said even though it was not possible to give the volume the ultimate test of actual use in the seminary classroom. The strongest argument in favor of this text is the excellent division and arrangement of matter. Author and reviser have appropriately separated their treatment of the ancient Church into two periods: (1) foundation of the Church to the Edict of Milan, and (2) Edict of Milan to the Second Council in Trullo (692). In each of these periods there is a topical consideration of all the important factors such as development of doctrine, literature, heresy, worship, organization, and growth; and each of these significant topics is given a careful, chronological study. Such a plan, in the experience of this reviewer, is ideal for the theological seminary course. Helpful, too, as the reviser himself indicates, is the fact that this text is up to date, incorporating material up to the middle of 1950.

In every book there are weak points. It seems that Tüchle himself realized this in regard to the bibliography, for he says that in the next revision he will limit the bibliography to works appearing since 1930. Although certain works pre-dating 1930 should find a place, this reviewer believes that the reviser is right in considering a shorter, more selective bibliography. As the work stands, the bibliography would frighten a seminarian by its very comprehensiveness, and, incidentally, in an English translation a note of German translations of French books seems a bit ponderous.

The general index is somewhat brief; but more undesirable still, many would say, are the references to sections and numbered paragraphs; page references are still the most practical and helpful in an index.

Despite these shortcomings, this text is certainly worthy of use in the theological seminary. (EMMET T. GLEESON)

BLAND, DAVID. *A History of Book Illustration: The Illuminated Manuscript and the Printed Book.* (Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Co. 1958. Pp. 448. $15.00.)

This is the first comprehensive treatment in English of a subject hitherto covered in numerous expensive and now often out-of-print monographs. While the author disavows originality, his perceptive synthesis surpasses most of his sources. His esthetic sense is sound, his knowledge of all the illustrative processes is both wide and deep, and his treatment of the technological means used in the illustration and decoration of manuscripts or printed pages is excellent. The integration of text with picture is unsurpassed as is the choice of almost 400 illustrations of which twenty are superb color reproductions. The reviewer would have preferred a colored reproduction of Celtic art to the inferior black and white from the Book of Kells whose initial work Bland decries in contrast to Morey who has cited the Celts for their vitality. This is but a minor mote as is his footnote indicating the monastic scriptorium in England had its beginning in the thirteenth century (p. 60 n.).

Bland's judgments are expressed surely and with good insight, as in his comments on the Spanish lack of genius in illustrating Amadis of Gaul and Don Quixote and that of the Danes in the case of Andersen. Although Bland says that in mediaeval manuscripts "the more beautiful the illumination, the less accurate the text" (p. 40), he points up the significance of illustration (and decoration) in perpetuating the modern classics; there is required today an interrelationship of literary and artistic genius to achieve maximum readership. Adults would certainly buy fewer children's books were it not for the illustrations of Tenniel, Caldecott, Crane, Greenaway, Pyle, the Provensens, *et al.* The place of the publisher is given due, even unusual, attention. He points out that many of the modern limited editions, particularly from France, become commercially successful through their erotic appeal.

He credits America with two notably modern developments, the "high pitch of perfection" attained by photography, and "the widespread employment by publishers of the freelance book designer, a phenomenon almost entirely American and one which has become general since the War. It may be that eventually these men will stand in the same relationship to the illustrator as the literary editor to the author" (p. 398). The significance of the British private presses is handled neatly.

Although this *History of Book Illustration* is encyclopedic in its geographical and chronological coverage, the style is maintained at a readable level throughout. This book should serve both as a fine introduction to the subject and as an excellent reference work, enhanced as it is by a good bibliography and an adequate index. (EUGENE P. WILLGING)

BOORSTIN, DANIEL J. *The Americans: The Colonial Experience.* (New York: Random House, Inc. 1958. Pp. 434. $6.00.)

This book should be around for a long time to come. While it may not rank as "the first major reinterpretation of American history since Turner, Parrington, and Beard" that its dust-jacket blurb proclaims, it is a fresh, new look at that history. Professor Boorstin, who teaches at the University of Chicago, is a Georgian reared in Oklahoma and has the background to do so without chauvinism or provinciality. He divides his appraisal into four books. The first (140 pages) discusses the socio-political milieu of Massachusetts Bay, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and Virginia. Book Two (114 pages) analyzes their "Viewpoints and Institutions"; Book Three (69 pages) treats "Language and the Printed Word," while Book Four (27 pages) deals with "Warfare and Diplomacy."

Dr. Boorstin's central thesis emerges most frequently in the fourth of Book One in his section on Virginia: "Transplanters." It is that colonial culture was far more the result of native shaping than of European influence in everything from Puritan sermons to "Southern hospitality." On this thesis the author proceeds to posit many a piquant generalization: American physicians were good general practitioners because their inability to travel to Europe spared them much "learned error"; the Virginia plantation equates with today's "company town"; the most indigenous product of our educational system was the college president; the press was a prop of the *status quo*. Dr. Boorstin's tone is equable, his style smooth and at times incisive. He can be quotable: Georgia projectors "were less interested in what was possible in America than in what had been impossible in Europe" (p. 84); "in America the 'is' became the yardstick of the 'ought'" (p. 158).

The second best feature of this work is its forty-six-page, double-column bibliography. To indicate a few flaws only emphasizes its quality: there are slips of the pen about the editorship of Yale's Franklin project (p. 385) and a J. K. Paulding title (p. 411); Tyler's *Literary History. . . .* was reprinted in 1957 (p. 376); there *is* a full length study of Isaiah Thomas (p. 415), by Clifford K. Shipton; why cite a 1901 monograph on Commissary Blair (p. 390) when S. R. Mohler's 1940 doctoral dissertation exists at the University of Chicago? For this reviewer's taste Dr. Boorstin employs "brilliant," in evaluating such titles, a bit too generously; his index is incomplete; and many people will be surprised to learn that William Byrd II was a "naïve" observer (p. 161). But these are minor blemishes on a shining canvas. Many and many an American ought to read *The Americans.* (CURTIS CARROLL DAVIS)

BOYD, JULIAN P. and WILLIAM H. GAINES, JR. (Eds.). *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson.* Volume 15: *27 March 1789 to 30 November 1789.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1958. Pp. xxxix, 677. $10.00.)

The dramatic events which took place in Paris in 1789 are vividly recounted in Volume 15 of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson.* During the opening stages of the French Revolution and Jefferson's last months in Paris, his position as American minister kept him discreetly aloof from the turmoil, yet he communicated frequently with Lafayette and lent suggestions for a Declaration of Rights. He received a first-hand account of the fall of the Bastille and was present when Louis XVI was "led in triumph by his people thro' the streets of the capital." Thrust into the limelight in connection with Mirabeau's charges against Necker, he extricated himself admirably, an episode definitively presented by the editors who, as usual, combine careful grouping of documents with precise and full annotation. The excitement of these months and Jefferson's thoughtful observations are here in lengthy dispatches to Jay, and in letters to Paine, Madison, Washington, and others. One to Madison contains his famous statement that "the earth belongs in usufruct to the living." The editors infer that he connected this doctrine more closely with Europe than with the contemporary American scene.

Letters from home inform Jefferson of developments in New York where a new American federal government was being established under the newly adopted Constitution. Included also are materials bearing on Jefferson's unabated scientific and literary interests and detailed accounts of his purchases and commissions in the world of books and art. Embarking for home in late September, Jefferson carried two passports, here excellently reproduced, one issued by Louis XVI, the other by the Paris Commune, endorsed by Lafayette.

A new feature in the series is the addition of supplementary materials, collected too late for insertion in their proper chronological sequence. From the years 1772-1789, they include several previously unpublished personal papers, and a hitherto undiscovered document on the ironic slave-cargo debt to Farrell & Jones. Altogether, this is one of the richest and most valuable volumes to date. Historians will welcome the new personal glimpses of the man, and the eye-witness accounts of Paris in 1789 by a sympathetic, penetrating, and restrained observer. (EDWARD M. MCNULTY)

CARTER, CLARENCE E. (Ed.). *The Territorial Papers of the United States*. Volume XXIII, *The Territory of Florida, 1824-1828.* (Washington: National Archives and Records Administration. 1958. Pp. v, 1191.)

The latest volume of the territorial papers of the United States is done with the same meticulous care that characterized preceding volumes. The period of Florida history covered by these papers runs from 1824 down to 1828 covering in part the activities of the first and second terms of William P. Duval as governor. Most of the documents are short and of little general interest, though one or the other, particularly the memorials of the state legislature to Congress, give more important items. The topics touched upon in the correspondence concern the difficulties of having the lands surveyed and the roads laid out, particularly one between St. Augustine and Pensacola; the plea to have a maritime court established at Key West to deal with the cases of the shipwrecks off the coast; the efforts to have Pensacola fortified and the ever present appeals for more money. The outstanding topic of the letters, however, is the unrest of the Florida Indians. These had become dissatisfied with the land given them by the treaty of 1823, since it was unproductive and allowed them no steady source of food. Under the circumstances the red men wandered oustide the confines set for them, sometimes killing livestock and sometimes the white owners of the livestock. Frequent letters were sent to Washington calling for army units to repress the Indians. Gradually it dawned on the territorial authorities, and those in Washington connected with Indian affairs, that a more satisfactory solution to the unrest could be found in removing the Indians to a territory west of the Mississippi. It was some time before this idea was to become acceptable to the tribes but in the end the move was to be accomplished.

Over 120 pages of an index, with double columns on each page, enables the researcher to find pertinent material quickly in this work. Because of this index, the fine printing job, and the clear notes accompanying the text this book is a model of its kind. (MICHAEL J. CURLEY)

Casey, Thomas F. *The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide and the Revision of the First Provincial Council of Baltimore (1829-1830).* [Vol. LXXXVIII, Analecta Gregoriana, Series Facultatis Historiae Ecclesiasticae.] (Rome: Apud Aedes Universitatis Gregorianae. 1957. Pp. xv, 233. $4.00.)

In this doctoral dissertation Father Casey of the Archdiocese of Boston uses documents in the archives of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide to reveal for the first time the manner in which that congregation studied the thirty-eight decrees of the First Provincial Council of Baltimore, the revisions that were recommended, and the consideration that was given to letters of petition from the fathers of the council for three special faculties. All the documents pertinent to the revision are appended (pp. 172-226).

The author's comments on several statements in Peter Guilday's excellent *History of the Councils of Baltimore* (New York, 1932), which will still be used by most students, are judged important enough to be included here so Guilday's text can be corrected. Guilday stated when summarizing the first three decrees that they "legislated against the removal of members of religious orders in pastoral capacity without the consent of the Ordinary" (p. 90). Father Casey comments: "While similar legislation . . . was issued in 1810, there was no explicit repetition of this sort in 1829" (p. 70). Concerning Guilday's statement: "The Fathers of the Council were obliged to insist with Propaganda on the non-existence of the *jus patronatus* in this country, as declared in their Sixth Decree . . ." (p. 91), the author says: "This assertion, made without documentary support, does not appear tenable in the light of available evidence" (p. 81). On another topic Guilday wrote: "The Sacred Congregation seems to have taken alarm at this difference in authority . . ." (p. 95). Commenting on this the author says: "Phrasing the reaction of Propaganda in these words seems to color the actual reaction, which was quite firm and positive, . . . with a tone of excitement and a lack of control which are not verified in the sources" (p. 142). Historians of the American Church who have a special interest in Anthony Kohlmann, S.J., and Bishop John Dubois, who reviewed the acts and decrees of the council at the request of Propaganda, will find in this study the unpublished and hitherto unused reports that they submitted. There is no index to this work. (Patrick H. Ahern)

Craig, Gordon A. *From Bismarck to Adenauer: Aspects of German Statecraft.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1958. Pp. xvii, 156. $4.50.)

A sense of proportion becomes the historian as well as the statesman. This quality, along with an easy, graceful style, characterizes Professor Craig's studies of the personal factors that have shaped German diplomacy since Bismarck. These studies, joined here in a delightful book, were originally the 1958 Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History at the Johns Hopkins University. To judge Germany's statesmen the author uses the political criteria proposed by Max Weber in his *Politics as a Vocation:* passion; a feeling of responsibility; and a sense of proportion.

The author focuses on personality: how—for good or for ill—have the statesman's personal traits informed his public acts? What emerges are tightly drawn, perceptive analyses of the "political personality" and its projection in foreign policy. Much historical sophistication attends this effort, which obviously requires a subtle literary hand, and which, if it is to achieve its purpose, must avoid facile generalization. Professor Craig succeeds on these counts and thereby avoids another pitfall for unwary diplomatic historians—the suggestion that foreign policy making is only a muddle handed on from one statesman to another.

German diplomacy has often been depicted that way. But the author avoids it, even though he begins with Bismarck, whom he admires, and proceeds toward lesser men, most of whom he pities. Only Bismarck fares well by Max Weber's standards. After Bismarck, the conduct of German diplomacy was alternately mean and spiteful, or overreaching and theatrical. Kiderlen-Wächter's dispatch of the cruiser *Panther* to Agadir in 1911 illustrates its "fruitless and self-defeating displays of violence." From this Professor Craig draws an old-fashioned, though sound conclusion: Bismarck's immediate successors lacked the political refinement and the moral sensibility capable of maintaining the German position in the world.

Germany's post-war statesmen are scrutinized in the same dispassionate way. Stresemann fares well; Rathenau and Bruening fare ill. Stresemann —the architect of Locarno—had perspective, selflessness, steadfastness, and courage. He was a responsible statesman in whose hands the restoration of Germany's freedom of action in eastern Europe had a less ominous meaning than is sometimes inferred to it. Rathenau's mysticism and his impulsiveness held more serious dangers. More present day interest may attach to the criticism of Bruening's diplomatic bungling. His hastiness, expressed in a preference for action for action's sake, unquestionably contributed to the debacle of German democracy.

In its rebuilding the author extends fulsome praise to Adenauer—which seems overblown when contrasted with his cautious reserve toward the others. He quotes with approval a tribute to Adenauer for having rescued the civilian spirit of the German bourgeoise. Adenauer's statecraft has been free of the corrosive national spirit that has disfigured so much German diplomacy. Moreover, he has successfully enlisted German public opinion in his effort to establish a new European order based on international co-operation, not power political rivalry. If he fails, Professor Craig, observes, no one will be able to blame his failure on either a lust for conquest or chauvinism. (WILLIAM O. SHANAHAN)

CRAVEN, AVERY O. *Civil War In The Making, 1815-1860.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1959. Pp. xiv, 115. $3.00.)

This small book by Professor Craven consists of lectures delivered last year at Louisiana State University. It is not a book that everyone will read calmly. Professor Craven's opinions have always commanded attention and respect, together with a very healthy and irate indignation from some. The deceptive simplicity of the work will draw attention and respect from every reader, and howls of protest from more than a few. The book is concerned with the "why" of the Civil War. Professor Craven has devoted much of his life to this subject and anyone interested in this period will certainly profit from his research, intelligent writing, and forceful interpretation. Although brief and short on detail, it is a well-considered and authoritative statement of the case as the author sees it.

Professor Craven characterizes the pre-Civil War period as a "cold war," and he uses current phrases and terms in treating it. His analysis of the growth of an era of suspicion which was whipped to a frenzy during the war can be seen in many current news events. The problem of slavery as a burning issue of the time is handled with originality and reserve. Co-existence is the problem. He shows that the war came inevitably because the political machinery broke down, and the reasons he assigns for the breakdown are open to attack from many angles.

Finally, the book contains several seemingly contradictory statements. Some of the confusion arises from the fact that the reader is not always certain whether a statement is to be attributed to the author or to someone else. The South has found a learned and staunch champion in this author, although, perhaps, not the author of a "calm" book. An excellent companion volume would be Bruce Catton's *America Goes To War.* (RICHARD G. THEISEN)

CUMMING, WILLIAM P. *The Southeast in Early Maps, With an Annotated Check List of Printed and Manuscript Regional and Local Maps of Southeastern North America During the Colonial Period.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1958. Pp. ix, 275, 67 plates. $12.50.)

The principal part of this monumental work is an annotated list of regional and local manuscript and printed maps, produced before 1776, of all or part of what is now southeastern United States. To avoid duplicating the works of others and to keep the publication to a manageable size, maps of Florida only or of Virginia only or of local areas within these two states have been excluded. Maps of areas extending beyond the bounds of this study, including maps of the continent of North America, have been included if they had an important bearing on the development of the cartography of the Southeast. World maps useful in tracing the discovery and delineation of the Southeast are discussed in an introductory essay. Each map is listed chronologically by date and tag line. The latter is a brief, convenient designation referring to the explorer, surveyor, cartographer, or publisher, whichever has the most significant association with the map. The full title, scale, size, and area covered are given and the date and place of first publication and subsequent editions are noted. The description for each map is quite complete, including a statement of the area shown, the significant features delineated on the map, and bibliographic problems involved. Moreover, historical or biographical facts concerning the map are briefly stated and the description includes as well a comparative evaluation of the particular map in terms of its role in unfolding the cartographic history of the region. If the map has been the subject of previous scholarly investigation, reference to it is given. The location of original manuscript maps and the names of libraries which possess copies of published maps or photo-reproductions are listed. These depositories include well known libraries and some lesser known specialized collections from coast to coast as well as a few famous foreign archives and libraries. There are 450 numbered entries in the check list which is thoroughly indexed.

There are sixty-seven excellent collotype reproductions of those maps which form significant milestones in the unfolding of the Southeast. Although details are sometimes lost in reduction to fit an 8½" x 11" page, the quality of the reproductions is such that legibility is easily restored by using a glass. Each plate is briefly described and explained in a separate section.

In an introductory essay, extensively annotated by twenty-nine pages of footnotes, Cumming discusses the historical cartography of southeastern United States in terms of three distinct periods. The Primary Period, from the first sighting of the coast to 1590, was dominated by what Cumming calls "mother maps," compilations based on sketches, reports, and charts of early expeditions. The significance of these rather crude maps is related to the number of times they were copied rather than to their relative accuracy. The second period, from the end of the sixteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, was transitional. Mapping during this period was associated with the process of settlement, and the maps were based on actual though crude surveys. They contained many more details, and unlike maps of the Primary Period, features can be identified on modern maps. The third period is characterized by maps based on the work of professional surveyors using refined instruments. Requirements of navigation dictated early surveys of rivers and harbors, but expanding settlement and conflicting land titles soon resulted in interior surveys as well. Both historians and geographers are sure to find this work an essential tool when dealing with the pre-revolutionary southeastern United States. No college or university library can afford to be without it. (Kenneth J. Bertrand)

Cunliffe, Marcus. *The Nation Takes Shape, 1789-1837.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1959. Pp. vii, 222. $3.50.)

This volume in the University of Chicago American Civilization series depicts a period of American history that is not often written about. Mr. Cunliffe approaches the early days of the American nation as a visitor from abroad. Throughout the volume there are many references to periodicals of the times, especially the *Democratic Review,* which describes this half century of progress in all the "substantial elements of national grandeur which is believed to have had scarce a parallel in the annals of mankind." During this period the Union had grown from thirteen to twenty-six states. Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, John Jay, *et al.* among the founding fathers had lived to see many of the changes, but by 1837 most of the great men who had played an important part in the development of the Union had died, and national leadership had passed from the autocratic class to the poorer struggling pioneer leaders like Andrew Jackson.

Mr. Cunliffe, in his account of the first half century of life under the Constitution, sees an American character emerging under the new federal constitution as the nation expanded across the continent. He shows how the colonials had begun to become Americans, and he is especially successful in portraying the strong and conflicting tendencies—among others, the conflict between the city and the hinterlands, between one section of a nation and another, and between experimentalism and conservatism. The author has chosen one of the most complex periods of American history and in his treatment has attempted to show the light as well as the technological side of American life, although at times one does get the feeling that he relied too heavily upon the ideas of others. (Anthony L. Milnar)

Curti, Merle. *The Making of an American Community. A Case Study of Democracy in a Frontier County.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1959. Pp. vii, 483. $8.50.)

This co-operative study under the direction of the Frederick Jackson Turner professor of history at the University of Wisconsin was undertaken for two reasons: to demonstrate the possibility of achieving objectivity in writing history through the interpretation of statistical data and to test Turner's hypothesis that the most important effect of the frontier has been the promotion of American democracy. To achieve their first objective the authors apply the statistical or quantitative method effectively to census data revealing some interesting and undoubtedly more accurate information on the social mobility, economic and occupational status, school attendance and literacy of the Trempealeau settlers than could be obtained through the use of the traditional historical methods.

Although the authors admit that Turner over-emphasized the role of the frontier in American democracy and minimized other factors, they accept his main argument as essentially sound. They broadly interpret Turner's democracy to mean "an involved widespread participation in the making of decisions affecting the common life, the development of initiative and self-reliance, and equality of economic and cultural opportunity." They show that democracy in this sense existed in the Trempealeau community. Statistical comparison of farm groups, e.g., shows that economic differences narrowed considerably during the years 1850-1880 thus indicating a tendency toward economic equality. What is not so clear is the assumption that democracy is due chiefly to the frontier environment. Politically, Trempealeau County could be classified with the type of frontier community that developed within the framework of an already established state government which followed the eastern pattern. Democracy, therefore, was the continuance of such familiar democratic procedures as town meetings, discussion, political campaigning, and elections. Immigrants adapted themselves well, but was this not to be expected? They had come to the United States for that purpose—to achieve political, economic, and social equality in a climate of democratic government.

This case study evidences genuine scholarship and painstaking research and succeeds in maintaining a proper balance between the quantitative and traditional historical methods. The latter are used effectively in the sections on the settlers, their social relationships, and their political, cultural, and religious activity. Students of history and the social sciences interested in the quantitative approach will welcome the numerous tables and charts as well as the appendices which describe the method used in collecting and recording data. This study will interest chiefly the historian and the social scientist, although the general reader will find extremely interesting reading in the chapters on the social, cultural, and political phases of life in frontier Trempealeau County. (SISTER M. JUSTILLE McDONALD)

DANIÉLOU, JEAN, S.J. *The Lord of History.* Translated by Nigel Abercrombre. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1958. Pp. viii, 375. $5.00.)

This book is composed of twenty-four essays and lectures that in some way touch upon the significance of history for the Christian. The title may be misleading if it causes one to expect a sustained and progressive exposition of the Christian theology of history. The sub-title more correctly indicates the intention as "Reflections on the Inner Meaning of History." And reflections they are, at times almost becoming a meditation. The general subject is approached from many directions, but all point to Christ, Who gives history its direction, meaning, and hope.

Father Daniélou explains that for a Christian there cannot be a philosophy of history, but only a theology of history, for it is the continuing story of the interaction between divine Providence and man's free will. It is God Who calls and man who must make answer to that call. And the Scriptures tell us of this divine intervention into the life of man and his response—or his failure to respond, so that "the Christian theology of history is all in the Bible" (p. 149). Both salvation and judgment have been effected by Christ and so His first coming marks the beginning of the last days which will be ended by the unpredictable time of His second coming. Calling on the witness of the fathers, the author shows that the mystery of time in these last days "is to allow the return of free wills to God, which cannot but be gradual" (pp. 250-251). This whole period is a time of crisis and divine judgment; it is a paradox of fulfilment and expectation. The divine promises are already fulfilled in Christ and the Christian waits for them to be completely fulfilled in His Church. The addition of a bibliography to this work would be helpful because most of the references to other works are very meager—usually only the name of an author is cited in a passing fashion. (CHRISTIAN CEPLECHA)

DAWSON, CHRISTOPHER. *The Movement of World Revolution.* (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1959. Pp. 179. $3.00.)

This small volume is largely a collection of essays that have previously appeared in *History Today, Four Quarters, Commonweal,* and the *Times Literary Supplement* of London, as well as extended observations on subjects previously discussed in the author's *Understanding Europe, Religion and the Rise of Western Culture,* and *The Judgment of the Nations.* But it indicates also an increasing preoccupation with the historical significance of oriental culture, perhaps the most neglected area of investigation among the philosophers of history.

Mr. Dawson, at present the Charles Chauncey Stillman Professor of Roman Catholic Studies in the Divinity School at Harvard, suggests that a process of world revolution has passed through three successive phases: the age of discovery and colonization which created a global system of communication and commerce; secondly, an age characterized by the breakdown of Asiatic empires under the impetus of western technology, economic pressure, and western ideas; and finally, the phase of internal transformation of oriental culture, occasioned by western education and the rise of nationalist movements. The very hostility of the peoples of Asia and Africa against the West is seen to co-exist paradoxically with the rapid diffusion of western science and political ideologies.

Mr. Dawson sees our crisis resolved neither by the roseate expectations of world socialism nor by secular forms of world organization. He sees deliverance only in a return to traditional religious sanctions, and in the acceptance of transcendent authority by nations as well as individuals. (Robert Paul Mohan)

de Bertier de Sauvigny, G. *France and the European Alliance, 1816-1821: The Private Correspondence between Metternich and Richelieu.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1958. Pp. xiii, 130. $2.75.)

The lack of emphasis on private correspondence between the heads of state has been conspicious in the field of historical writing. Couple this with the lack of historical data on the unique, but hitherto obscure figure of the successor of Talleyrand, the Duc de Richelieu (a descendant of a brother of the cardinal-minister of Louis XIII), and you have the core of two historical problems. But these historical vacuums are filled by the efforts of Father de Bertier de Sauvigny's short but erudite work. A specialist in the field of the Restoration monarchy in France, he sheds a penetrating light by examining a segment of the diplomatic relations between France and Austria during the period 1816-1821. His "eyes" are the private correspondence between Metternich and Richelieu. Classifying the exchange of letters as "important weapons in the arsenal of diplomacy," his chronological approach leads him to study the main diplomatic trends under headings such as, the internal situation in France after the Napoleonic wars, the first administration of Richelieu (September, 1815-December, 1818), its disintegration beginning a period of transition (1819-1820), and Richelieu's return to power with his second administration (March, 1820-December, 1821). In presenting these primary sources of French correspondence the editor conveys a vivid psychological and diplomatic portrait of Metternich and Richelieu.

France, a defeated and war-torn country, looks to Richelieu for guidance. Following in the footsteps of Talleyrand as "chief engineer," Richelieu attempts to steer France on the path of political rehabilitation and restore its hegemony as a great power. Notable achievements in this direction are seen in the first ministry of Richelieu with the payment of the French indemnity and the consequent evacuation of French soil by allied troops. Feeling his duty had been accomplished with France's liberation, he withdrew from the political scene only to be recalled in 1820. Metternich, on the other hand, attempts to prevent French resurgence and to maintain the preservation of Austrian hegemony. These policies of self-interest widened the differences between these heads of state and breached any intention toward friendly inclination toward one another. These letters give the historian a perceptive treatment of an important but hitherto obscure aspect of Franco-Austrian relations.

As regards sources it should be noted that the editor states in an excellent introduction that the bulk of his correspondence comes from three main archival collections: 1) the archives of the State Chancery of Austria, 2) the archives of the French Foreign Office, 3) the personal papers of Richelieu deposited in the library Victor Cousin in the Sorbonne. Incidentally, a key to French words is lacking which would be an aid to those readers who have a limited knowledge of French, but this omission does not detract from the contribution which Professor de Bertier de Sauvigny has made in this work. (Charles A. Gliozzo)

Degler, Carl N. *Out Of Our Past.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1958. Pp. xvii, 484. $6.00.)

The author of this volume, a study of the chief forces that have shaped the development of modern America, is an assistant professor of history at Vassar College. Basing his account largely on secondary sources, Mr. Degler goes over much ground that is familiar, shedding new light on the influences of Puritanism, the frontier, the role of labor, religion, immigration, the farm, and the city. More space is given to the Negro than is found in most histories. But much is omitted, e.g., there is no mention of the two world wars and their contribution to the American character and outlook. Professor Degler is highly selective and critical in using his sources. He rejects Turner's thesis that the frontier was the leaven of democracy and he holds that "deTocqueville is a much better source for the cultural impact of the frontier." Charles Beard and Louis Hacker, he thinks, are guilty of putting the cart before the horse in tracing the cause of the Civil War to the growing strength and aggressiveness of northern industry *vis à vis* the agrarian South. Degler is sympathetic to the Radicals in describing Reconstruction and he considers Randall's judgment of them too harsh. In general, he feels that the South did not fare too badly when one considers the treatment of defeated nations before and since. On other points Mr. Degler prefers Hofstader's view of Jackson to Schlesinger's and he takes exception to Nevins' rationalization of the tactics of the industrial giants in terms of their success in building a powerful America.

The role of big men is toned down in this study. T. R., Robert LaFollette, and F.D.R. seem only incidental to the movements associated with their names. Professor Degler is decidedly biased in favor of Progressivism and the New Deal, but he insists that despite these reform movements the American people remain basically conservative. *Out Of Our Past* is an extremely readable volume. It contains an excellent critical bibliography. (JOHN J. CARRIGG)

DE LA BEDOYERE, MICHAEL. *The Cardijn Story.* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1958. Pp. xi, 196. 15/.)

Mr. de la Bedoyere could not but make the story of Monsignor Cardijn largely the story of the Young Catholic Workers. The author has chosen the most pertinent documents from the YCW archives to trace the growth of Monsignor Cardijn's concept of the lay apostolate. Early in life Joseph Cardijn vowed that he would die trying to inject Christian principles into the milieu of working youth. "When I left the seminary for the holidays," he reflected, "I saw again my old friends. They had entered the factory and were already corrupted, lost. I vowed that this would not go on." As a young priest student at the University of Louvain and then, as professor at a minor seminary, his free time and vacations were given to the study of actual working conditions. During both world conflicts Monsignor Cardijn was imprisoned by the Germans, solitary hours that he utilized to consolidate his thought on the Christian social apostolate. Monsignor Cardijn remained courageous throughout the hardships involved in the birth of his social movement, being always the spiritual dynamo and giving his disciples a sound spiritual formation. As leader of the YCW, he knew the art of delegating authority as well as the responsibility of organization to the young workers themselves.

Mr. de La Bedoyere skillfully demonstrates how the ideals and principles of this splendid priest guided the YCW through periods of both internal and external trouble. This same spirit and basic ideology are most clearly set down in the last chapter, "The Secret of Cardijn." The YCW movement, as well as Monsignor Cardijn's concept of the lay apostolate—two important phases of the modern history of the Church—have never been the subject of serious study. Thus Mr. de La Bedoyere opens wide vistas to the student of church history. The parish priest will find in this life story the ideal of a dynamic, Christ-like, and eminently practical priest. The spirit of the YCW is the basis for any lay movement. Catholic readers will find the will of the last four popes regarding the lay apostolate brought to life in *The Cardijn Story.* (JOHN G. KUHN)

DE STUDER, ELENA F.S. *La Trata de negros en el Rio de la Plata durante el siglo XVIII.* (Buenos Aires: Publicaciones del Instituto de Historia Argentina "Doctor Emilio Ravignani," CI. 1959. Pp. 378.)

This volume is publication No. 101 in the distinguished series of studies of colonial Argentina which have been published serially by the University of Buenos Aires beginning in 1908. Señora de Studer begins with a general review of the commercial system of Spain in the Indies. Then, she traces the administration of the Spanish slave trade from its inception about 1528 down to the end of the nineteenth century. The book to this point relies heavily on secondary works such as those of Scelle and Molinari and is not impressive.

There follows the particularized treatment of the role of the La Plata area in the Spanish slave trade. This section, written largely from original materials in the Seville archives and the Archivo General de la Nación of Buenos Aires, is a valuable contribution and gives important new insights on the local operations of the ugly business. The insistent demand for slave labor by the La Plata colonists was a compelling factor in forcing the Spanish government to grant private licenses, *asientos* or corporate monopolies, and even treaty concessions to meet the need. These concessions usually became a pretext whereby Portuguese, Dutch, French, and English interests opened up La Plata markets to their other goods and secured cargoes of hides and grain for the return. The willingness of the settlers to do business and the collusion of local officials made the legal importation of Negroes a mere cloak to hide widespread smuggling activities. It seems doubtful that the slave trade itself ever showed a profit, although British, French, and Spanish sovereigns were willing to join in the speculation. Disease and long delays for quarantine in the ports carried off hundreds. Most fatal was the acute melancholia which caused many to seek death deliberately.

Numerous charts, one showing the entire La Plata operation of the South Seas Company, a good index, and bibliography make this a very useful work. (PAUL S. LIETZ)

DZIEWANOWSKI, M. K. *The Communist Party of Poland. An Outline of History.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1959. Pp. xvi, 269. $7.50.)

Historically the Poles have proven hostile to any importations from their traditional foes, Germany and Russia. When in the course of the sixteenth century their nobility tended toward the contemporary religious innovations it was to Calvinism to which they temporarily adhered. Lutheranism represented German influence; therefore, it was rejected.

How then, in our time, can we explain the existence of a Communist Poland? By force of arms, of course. But how did that transformation take place? Upon what foundations was it built? And what particular problems does it face in light of the hostility of the overwhelming part of the population? These are some of the problems discussed in Professor Dziewanowski's fascinating history of *The Communist Party in Poland.* It does not claim to be a definitive work, for the most important archival sources, those of the Comintern and of the Cominform, are still not open to scholarly research. Professor Dziewanowski's work is based upon those materials available in the West, most notably those at the Hoover War Library and in the Trotsky Archives, confirmed by interviews with former party members and by his own observations during his 1958 trip to Poland. The materials he has amassed are more than are available even to official party historians in Poland. Though it was intended as a point of departure for subsequent investigations, it will probably remain a definitive work for many years to come.

The first half of the work traces the development of the Socialist, and later the Communist, movements in Poland from the unsuccessful insurrection of 1863 to the organization of the Polish Worker's Party in 1942. The affair "Luxemburg," the effects of the Polish-Russian War of 1920, and the dissolution of the party in 1938 are among the major areas covered here. In the second half the author discusses the manner in which the party seized power in Poland. The conditions which the existence of the Catholic Church created—the policy of coexistence between Catholicism and Marxism followed until 1948, the ensuing campaign against the Church, the failure of the *modus vivendi* of 1950—are well covered. The work concludes with the background to "The Thaw," its effects, and the results of the October upheaval. The book "focuses on the Communist movement as a social and political force, and not upon the internal functions of the party machinery *per se.*" It is well written, authoritative, and extremely interesting reading, and its bibliography and forty-five pages of notes are a mine of information. The work is #32 of the Harvard Russian Research Center Studies. (EUGENE KUSIELEWICZ)

ETTELDORF, RAYMOND T. *The Catholic Church in the Middle East.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1959. Pp. 184. $3.75.)

The Middle East has to a large extent abandoned Christ and in much the same manner Christianity has abandoned the Middle East. Around this theme Monsignor Etteldorf has woven the fruits of almost a decade of experience as a member of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church as well as a frequent traveller in the eight countries about which he writes. Anyone who has been either a student or an observer of the

Middle East today will testify to the complicated skein of religious, cultural, political, and economic factors in which its millions of inhabitants move. In practically every point he takes up Monsignor Etteldorf gives the reader a clear and understandable bird's-eye view. Most Americans will have had enough newspaper, radio, and TV contact to comprehend the play of secular forces in that part of the world which the book describes. Moreover, a basic concept of the Eastern Rites, the unfortunate schisms, and the persecutions of past centuries will give the religious-minded reader a framework in which to fit the author's portrayal of Christianity there today.

Born of the writer's rich experience with the working problems of the Mid-East missions, the book is at once realistic and full of hope. One learns of the crushing pressure of Moslem distaste for Christianity. We note the ever-lurking influence of Moscow striving to turn both Moslem and Orthodox against the Church, portrayed as an instrument of western imperialism. The materialistic dreams of the new State of Israel are shown to be taking Jewish eyes farther and farther from the Messias. Yet the Catholics of the Middle East, who have had to survive by their wits, are holding on. Many orthodox individuals and groups would come back to Rome if we could but send priests, brothers, and sisters to teach and minister to them. Workers, schools, churches, medical dispensaries—the missionary and his spiritual weapons—must be supplied by the rest of the Catholic world, if the work is to go on and to be successful. Now that Pope John XXIII has decided on a general council which is sure to turn its eyes to the East and the healing of its ancient schisms, Catholics should consider it more of a duty than ever before to learn of the Middle East. Monsignor Etteldorf has furnished an invaluable starting point by this concise and reliable volume. (W. KAILER DUNN)

FICHTER, JOSEPH H., S.J. *Parochial School: A Sociological Study.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1958. Pp. xii, 495. $6.00.)

"St. Luke's" school in a mid-western industrial city has in this book a virtually complete record of its year 1956-1957, compiled by a team of ten graduate students under the direction of an experienced and productive sociologist of parochial institutions. Its 632 pupils and their eleven religious and lay teachers, as well as the three priests of the parish, were under virtual daily observation; parochial activities associated with the school were observed as they occurred. The 181 Catholic pupils of a nearby public elementary school were also studied, although less intensively, to permit comparisons. Parents of both groups were interviewed both individually and in group discussions. The results are presented in four sections headed "Patterns of Socialization," "Structures of Group Action," "Agencies of Control," and "Social Correlates of the Parochial School."

It is as a descriptive study of the operation of a parochial school that this book can be said to be a significant contribution, a first of its kind. It may be especially useful for those students of the social sciences and education who have never had opportunities for direct observation of Catholic elementary education. Parenthetically, these may suspect an apologetic touch in the reporting; this book will not provoke a controversy comparable to that over its author's *Southern Parish.* A certain lack of methodological rigor is evident in a diffuse analytical scheme and in statistical inadequacies. General concepts are sometimes inadequately supported by descriptions of research procedures, as in the investigation of social class, in which criteria for differentiation are listed but not procedures for placement of families in what appears to be an atypical class pyramid. Similarly, reliability and validity of instruments are not discussed and there is ground for suspicion of excess interpretation of some statistical differentials; tests of significance are not employed. It is to be hoped that the empirical data presented will suggest further research on the social systems involved in American Catholic education. (C. JOSEPH NUESSE)

GAY, PETER. *Voltaire's Politics. The Poet as Realist.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1959. Pp. xii, 417. $6.00.)

Peter Gay, associate professor of history in Columbia University, has written an excellent, objective study of Voltaire's forays into politics, as a means of determining his true political attitudes; but he has prefaced it with an almost belligerent affirmation of secularism for our time that may well drive away the very readers most apt to welcome it before they even reach the text. Nevertheless, those who weather the polemics of the preface and the prologue will find that he has made a most valuable contribution to our understanding of Voltaire, of the developing crisis in the "Old Regime," and of the "terms" upon which he takes his stand with Voltaire —thus easing much of the sting of his opening salvo.

It was Voltaire's Geneva years, and his support of the popular cause there, which enable Professor Gay to throw into relief his life long dedication to the *thèse royale* in French affairs: premising the uniqueness and the historic development of each country, his struggles were always for "toleration, the rule of law, and freedom of opinion." That it was not "enlightened despotism" for which he stood was revealed most clearly in the break with his friend, the Duc de Choiseul, upon the latter's fall from power in 1770. Choiseul's support seemed to come from the very forces which prevented the restoration of effective monarchical authority—and it was just this which the many "affairs," like that of Calas, indicated as the great *desideratum.* Perhaps, because he had stood his ground so tenaciously for a lifetime Voltaire was to understand the full significance of Turgot's fall in 1776: the monarchy had crumbled—the *thèse royale* had been little more than utopianism and some kind of revolution had become inevitable. The narrative is very readable and the forty-page bibliographical note quite useful. (ELDON M. TALLEY)

HALASZ, NICHOLAS. *In the Shadow of Russia. Eastern Europe in the Postwar World.* (New York: Ronald Press Co. 1959. Pp. ix, 390. $5.00.)

This is a strange book. Disregarding the most important publications which in recent years have studied the same problem—to mention only the excellent symposium on *The Fate of East Central Europe* edited by S. D. Kertesz and the seven volumes on *East Central Europe under the Communists* edited by Robert F. Byrnes—the author suggests a new interpretation by a rather surprising, if not confusing arrangement of the basic material. In the first part of his book he discusses separately the "seven states" (Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, Hungary, and Czecho-Slovakia) which came under the control of Soviet Russia immediately after Germany's defeat. But he tells their post-war story, interrupted by a highly questionable survey of their earlier history, only until 1947, obviously holding the opinion that up to that year conditions were, after all, not too bad, in some respects even promising. In the second part, eastern Europe is treated as a whole, although precisely in more later years the situation developed differently in the various countries, at least in Yugoslavia, Poland, and Hungary. The last chapter, "The Ice Breaks," which follows the description of "The Cold War Years" ends with very optimistic conclusions: "The two peoples, Russian and American, who have so much in common, appear to hate each other," and a return to "the more humanistic inspirations of Marxism may wipe out the artificial dividing line between west and east in Europe."

The present reviewer, whose *History of Poland* is listed among the twelve "standard works" which were the author's "main sources," prefers not to point out how completely his interpretation of Poland's past differs from that of Mr. Halasz. He must, however, take exception to many comments on the policy of the Vatican, to the unfair treatment of Cardinals Stepinac and Mindzenty, and to the statement that Cardinal Wyszynski's "unorthodox" (!) stand gave to the Church in Poland "the same freedom and power it had enjoyed in the state before World War II." (OSCAR HALECKI)

HARWELL, RICHARD B. (Ed.). *The Union Reader.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958. Pp. xxii, 362. $7.50.)

As the anniversary of the Civil War approaches the interest in this great epoch of American history will increase in intensity and productivity.

This will be, and to some extent has already been, a reappraisal of the entire war. There has been a scholarly list of famous authors who have studied and re-evaluated every aspect of the war from the organization of armies to correspondence of the generals concerning every encounter with the enemy. Of late years there is a growing interest in the opinion of the ordinary soldier North and South. Editors have searched old records and letters in an attempt to piece together the story of the GI of the Civil War. Many interesting aspects of camp life in the 1860's have given invaluable information to readers and have brought to them the personal aspect of this terrible carnage. Richard Harwell has attempted to do much the same thing in his *Union Reader*. He did the same work for the South in his *Confederate Reader*. The present work gives excerpts from eye-witnesses both laymen and soldiers.

While most of the selections are from competent observers, it is this reviewer's opinion that selections from ordinary soldiers in the field tend to confuse the battle with the actions of an ordinary brigade. Movements of certain sections of the main army without relation to the general troop movements leave the unlearned strategist lost on the battlefield. One selection, taken from Hollister's *History of the First Regiment of Colorado Volunteers,* is admitted by the editor as exaggerated. There is given a quote of Hollister many years later that "there is nothing in the whole book that I can now tolerate, and I wonder that I could have put my name, fool that I was at the time, to such stuff." There seems to be no point in perpetuating such unreliable history. Perhaps, Harwell wanted to point out the unreliability of some observers on the spot; if so, there may be justification for the account. The majority of the selections will be of interest to the general reader. (ROGER J. BARTMAN)

HEILBRON, BERTHA L. *The Thirty-Second State. A Pictorial History of Minnesota.* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society. 1958. Pp. ix, 306. $8.95.)

Minnesotans have hailed Miss Heilbron's volume with great enthusiasm. Culminating Minnesota's centennial year this volume stands as a pictorial monument of the state. It is a source of pleasure not only to the old timers who remember the "good old days" and enjoy seeing them come to life again, but also to the "youngsters" who find a certain thrill in seeing pictured the development of their home towns and other familiar places. To many it will not be a source of new information, but a different medium of known history. Covering Minnesota from the French exploration period to the centennial year of 1958, the book is divided into two parts. Part one is a chronological survey of the period preceding statehood. Part two deals with the history of Minnesota as a state and is treated under such topics as agriculture, towns, social life, and transportation. Because this work is a pictorial history, Miss Heilbron had to choose areas to write about and as a consequence some areas have received little treatment.

This book is not a history of Minnesota illustrated by pictures, nor is it merely a picture book with explanations of the pictures arranged in chronological order. It is a work which has succeeded in interweaving narrative and pictures. The 477 illustrations are paintings, maps, drawings, daguerreotypes, and photographs gathered from many sources. Miss Heilbron, editor of *Minnesota History* and member of the Minnesota Historical Society's staff since 1919, has made pictorial history her special interest. Aided by her years of experience, the author made a splendid selection from the more than 1,000 pictures that she handled. This careful selection of pictures with an easy flowing narrative makes *The Thirty-Second State. A Pictorial History of Minnesota* an attractive and informative volume. (SISTER MARY MARK DONOVAN)

HULL, L. W. H. *History and Philosophy of Science.* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc. 1959. Pp. xi, 340. $5.00.)

The author states in the preface that this book is an attempt to bridge the gap between science and the humanities by considering scientific ideas in a context of history and philosophy. It is admittedly difficult for a writer to keep his personal philosophy from influencing his writing in such a work as this. At times, however, as in the chapter on the Middle Ages, Hull becomes quite offensive to Catholics. He finds the Church of the "Dark Ages" ruled by "bold bad bishops," and nearly all the leaders of the Church were "narrow-minded and intolerant." He would have us believe that the "unedifying scrambles for power among unscrupulous and worldly priests . . . who were ready to gain their ends by intrigue, bribery or murder" was the rule among the clergy. The churchmen, for worldly reasons, "saturated Christianity with pagan ideas," and "classical science and literature lay disregarded or unknown." This part of the book called to mind a sentence from Sarton's, *A Guide to the History of Science:* "The darkness of the Dark Ages of which uneducated scientists speak so glibly is partly the darkness of their own ignorance and unwisdom" (p. 56). Neither Sarton nor Thorndike is included among the forty-one "Books for Reference or Further Reading," nor are they referred to in the few footnotes. (MAXIMILIAN G. DUMAN)

JORDAN, WEYMOUTH T. *Ante-Bellum Alabama Town and Country.* (Tallahassee: Florida State University Studies, No. 27. 1957. Pp. vii, 178. $1.00.)

In his preface the author of this work indicates that it is a presentation of "certain case studies with the hope that by bringing them together they will furnish an insight into some of the important facets of Alabama's late ante-bellum history." Such a hope is by no means too sanguine, nor are the "insights" restricted to that state alone. At the time Alabama's social and economic developments were of a pattern with those of the other states of the deep South and this exposition of some concrete circumstances yields a picture that transcends the borders of a single state. The work examines a city (Mobile), a town (Marion), a planter family (the Kings of Perry County), rural social life, certain attitudes of the white population toward Negroes, and Alabama's early crusade in behalf of agriculture and manufacturing.

Of these chapters the last three will come as somewhat of a surprise to the casual reader of southern history. That entitled "Negro Peculiarities" offers much of value in assessing present problems of racial tension. A solid foundation of militant racism, justified and developed by outstanding members of learned societies in scientific and practical journals, goes far to explain the South's heritage of prejudice. Though no revision of the place of cotton in a one-crop economy is possible for the pre-Civil War period, early attempts at agricultural reform and the introduction of industry suggest a consciousness of the shortcomings of "King Cotton" that has often been neglected.

One might justly criticize an almost exclusively commercial view of the city of Mobile where examination of local newspapers, church records, and the archives of Spring Hill College would have supplied elements of social, religious, and intellectual history for a more balanced presentation. Also, the title of the work might mislead some to expect a general history of the period instead of a scholarly developed study of "certain cases." (OSCAR H. LIPSCOMB)

LAZZARINI, ANDREA. *Pope John XXIII.* (New York: Herder and Herder, Inc. 1959. Pp. 145. $3.25.)

The worldwide interest in the human side of the papacy was manifest in the perhaps unparalleled coverage accorded the death of Pius XII, the conclave, and the new pope by newspapers, magazines, radio, and television. Much of the news publication was accurate, dignified, and respectful; some of it was unduly sensational; a small portion of it was irresponsible, unworthy, and irreverent. The journalists proved singularly unsuccessful in attempting to predict the outcome of the conclave; their speculations on the workings of the conclave itself merited a gentle, good-humored rebuke from the new pontiff. They have now turned to biographies of Pope John XXIII. A spate of volumes dealing with the life of the present Holy Father has hit the bookshops. These biographies reflect the deep interest of the reading public, the eagerness of the publishers to satisfy the demand, and the unequal quality of the journalistic enterprise.

The volume under review, without preface or foreword to indicate the author's intent, is described by the publisher as "a complete and fully approved biography" by the literary editor of *L'Osservatore Romano,* who writes from "his deep personal knowledge of the Holy Father," acquired during his thirty years of work in the Vatican. It is a translation from the original Italian. German and Spanish editions have already been published; French, Dutch, and Japanese editions are in preparation. The meaning to be given to the word "complete" appears from the ninety-one pages of text, a translation of the pope's first broadcast, an epilogue of seven pages of anecdotes, and twenty-five pages of notes, concluding with twenty-four photographs of good quality. The original not being available, the reviewer can make no judgment on the accuracy of the translation. It is apparent that Lazzarini kept the Italian scene prominently in view. His stress on the political situation during the various periods of Angelo Roncalli's life, and the inner tensions and difficulties of Catholic Action of which Lazzarini has intimate knowledge, may strike the general reader as excessive in a work now intended for worldwide reading. Moreover, the biography gives evidence of haste in composition and the author skirts controversial questions with cautious generalities. At times he gives specific details regarding problems whose general nature he has not described, due, no doubt, to the narrow compass of his work. Read against a background of general knowledge of papal history in the twentieth century, this work contains interesting insights and factual information on some aspects of papal policy. (JOSEPH L. SHANNON)

McCOY, DONALD R. *Angry Voices: Left-of-Center Politics in the New Deal Era.* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press. 1958. Pp. viii, 224. $4.00.)

Little documentation is needed to remind us that the Liberty League saw Franklin D. Roosevelt as another Norman Thomas. More striking is the reminder, in this book and in Arthur M. Schlesinger's study of the Roosevelt era, that "progressives," "radicals," and those "left-of-center" viewed him as a jaunty Herbert Hoover selling economic nostrums disguised behind glamorous labels. Mr. McCoy, an historian at the University of Kansas, looks especially at the League for Independent Political Action, the American Commonwealth Political Federation, the Union Party, and the National Progressives of America. Groups seeking far-reaching economic and social changes, headed by able and ambitious leaders, were plentiful, he argues, but they could never cope with their internal weaknesses, especially problems of organization, nor with the "social-psychological attitudes of potential followers" and the political strategy of the Democratic Party.

The material in the book is valuable, and the conclusions are worth serious attention, but the gap between evidence and summary is too large. The account of the "left-of-center" programs and of the response which they commanded in the "radical" press is well presented. Struggles among the various organizations are handled adequately, and James A. Farley is used to good advantage in showing how fear of a defection on the left affected political strategy. But the "social-psychological attitudes of potential followers" never emerge. Indeed, it seems at times that the appeal of the left never goes beyond its convention-trotting leaders. Unsettled definitions of crucial terms like "progressive" raise the question, who belongs in the group? Mr. McCoy is quite uncertain about Father Coughlin and his implausible coterie in the 1936 election; yet they are discussed at length. The reader must accept the useful material here assembled and the suggestive last chapter without insisting on an organic relation between them. (FRANCIS L. BRODERICK).

MOWRY, GEORGE E. *The Era of Theodore Roosevelt, 1900-1912.* [New American Nation Series.] (New York: Harper & Bros. 1958. Pp. xvi, 330. $5.00.)

The era of Theodore Roosevelt launched America into time and space, for the nation entered the twentieth century readying itself for domestic reform and assuming new responsibilities far beyond its borders. Achievement of industrial maturity and a "highly differentiated society" was accompanied by "new intellectual and moral creeds . . . demanding a return to a more equalitarian life." Conflict, as Professor Mowry observes, was inevitable.

After sketching the material growth and the intellectual milieu, the author develops in a politico-economic context the principal presidential, legislative, and diplomatic problems of the Roosevelt and Taft administrations. Once again George Mowry has demonstrated that he has few peers in analyzing and describing the progressive movement. Facts flow with the narrative, topics fuse with chronological development. Particularly impressive are the passages stressing urban sources of reform, the middle-class background of progressives, the origins of the New Nationalism, Roosevelt's views on labor, the failure of *noblesse oblige* to carry over into foreign relations, T. R.'s suppleness and sense of the possible, Taft's conservatism and complacency, the significance of the elections of 1910, the confrontation of "dollar diplomacy" by an emergent peace movement, and the final alienation of Roosevelt from his successor.

The Era of Roosevelt is defective only in what seems to be the somewhat traditional political approach of a collaborative series. Social historians and the reading public might wish for more attention to feminism, temperance, education, culture, recreation, invention, mass production, and other facets of American life. Realism and naturalism receive their due in discussions of literature and philosophy, but there is little feeling for the benevolent impulses which sprang from a continuing romanticism best demonstrating its lasting power in the agrarian myth, the sentimental novels, and the pervasive optimism of Roosevelt's generation. Progressives may have been pragmatists, but, as Professor Mowry shows, their program was anti-materialistic. Americans were, in spite of all their doubts about laissez-faire capitalism, a highly romantic people. To challenge the author seriously on the import of the Roosevelt-Taft era or on the historical evolution of progressivism is farthest from this admiring critic's mind. This is a book expansive in scope, seething with provocative interpretation. George Mowry writes of the era of Roosevelt with authority and conviction, sobriety and animation, persuasion and eloquence. (JOHN RICKARDS BETTS)

MURPHY, FRANCIS X. *Pope John XXIII Comes to the Vatican.* (New York: Robert M. McBride. 1959. Pp. xv, 242. $3.95.)

In the first nine months following his election to the Apostolic See, more than twenty biographies of Pope John XXIII have been published in English. The majority of these books do not claim to be definitive and may be best described as popular lives. Their authors' principal aim has been to provide the general faithful with reverent, readable accounts of the life of Angelo Roncalli before October 28, 1958. This is what Father Murphy has very competently done for us in the book under review. The opening chapter details the events attending the death and obsequies of Pius XII; the concluding chapter describes the first official acts of the new pontiff. Both chapters may be skipped by readers who followed the accounts of these happenings in the secular or religious press, for nothing new has been added.

Readers of this REVIEW will be interested to learn that Pope John's acquaintance with things historical is more than a passing one. In the early years of his priesthood he held the post of professor of church history in the seminary of his native diocese, and it was during this period that he began writing his history of St. Charles Borromeo's visitation of the Diocese of Bergamo. The fifth and final volume of this weighty work appeared in 1959. At a later stage in his career, the future pope taught patrology at the Lateran Seminary in Rome.

Monsignor Roncalli's tenure as the Vatican's post-war representative to France is the subject of two chapters which will hold the attention of students of contemporary ecclesiastical history. In his delicate handling of the priest-worker question Archbishop Roncalli exemplified the papal diplomat at his best. The nuncio seems to have been in sympathy with the general aims and objectives of the Mission of France whose activities were finally curtailed by the Holy See in 1952. Although he never compromised or misinterpreted the attitude of Rome in this matter, he retained to the end the confidence and friendship of the French hierarchy. During his stay in Paris he also acted as the Holy See's delegate-observer to UNESCO and in this capacity he did much to counteract the socialistic and materialistic tendencies of many of that organization's early protagonists. This book, which was the May selection of the Catholic Book Club, contains ten pages of illustrations and an index. (CYPRIAN J. LYNCH)

NEALE, J. E. *The Age of Catherine de Medici.* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1959. Pp. 111. $2.75.)

This volume comprises a series of lectures delivered first in 1938 and repeated in 1942. Much of its vividness stems from the deft comparisons made to contemporary developments in Europe—the Nazi and Fascist movements, totalitarian systems, and ideological differences as issues of international conflict. An initial lecture on the religious background places responsibility for the "peculiarly deplorable" condition of the Church in France on the concordat of 1516, described as "a deal in the spoils of the Gallican Church" (p. 11). The vested interest of the monarchy in the religious *status quo* meant that a successful Protestant reform must oppose the monarchy. The Huguenots, because of their highly disciplined organization, were able to furnish the dynamism for this which the Lutheran and humanist reformers had lacked.

The next two lectures describe France's economic plight, the impoverishment and restlessness of the lesser nobility, the struggle of Guise, Bourbon, and Montmorency for control of the monarchy, and the merging of the latter issue with the religious conflict. Catherine's appeasement of the Huguenots—intended as a temporary expedient—emboldened their leaders and aroused Catholics. The Colloquy of Poissy revealed her inability to grasp the doctrinal differences which could not be bridged by facile compromises. She failed to conciliate the moderate Catholic party of Montmorency, thereby making possible their alliance with the Guise, and her over-estimate of the Huguenots served to increase their religious and political threat. Her fierce maternal instinct, aroused by the Huguenot attempt to capture Charles IX in 1567, led her to abandon moderation, and her fear of Coligny's domination over her son to the fatal decision for the St. Bartholomew's Massacre.

The concluding lecture rapidly sketches the *dénouement* of the religious wars, compares and contrasts the characters of Catherine de Medici and Elizabeth I of England, and examines the economic effects of the wars. A short bibliography for the general reader is appended. The value of the book is in its lucid and objective treatment of a complex theme. (ALICE M. CHRISTENSEN)

Ó BROIN, LEON. *The Unfortunate Mr. Robert Emmet.* (Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds, Ltd. 1958. Pp. 198. 21s.)

Although it is supposed to be a biography of Emmet, this book is really a study of the Dublin rising of 1803. The first sixty pages treat very sketchily of all but the last year of Emmet's life; the remaining two-thirds of the volume discusses the preparations for the rising, the event itself, and the aftermath. Since so much of Emmet's career was spent in underground activities, Ó Broin often cannot be certain of the movements or the plans of his hero. Perhaps the occasional irrelevant passages, unnecessarily long quotations, and other padding are intended to compensate for the dearth of factual information about Emmet. But this hardly excuses the jumbled arrangement of the book, e.g., chapter sixteen describes the rising of July 23, 1803, ending in Emmet's flight to the hills, but not until chapter twenty-three does the narrative return to Emmet. Then, with only one interruption, we follow him through his capture, trial, and execution. But we have not reached the end. There must be a chapter on the whereabouts of Emmet's grave, a discussion of Bonaparte's thoughts on invading Ireland, and, in Dickensian fashion, loose ends must be tied up by telling about the migration of Emmet's brother, Thomas Addis, to America, the romantically tragic end of Emmet's love, Sarah Curran, and finally, an appreciation of Robert Emmet. Along the way, Ó Broin has also knocked over a straw man by exonerating William Pitt from the charge of fomenting the rising.

Perhaps Emmet was "unfortunate." But it is not easy to approve of Ó Broin's efforts to give to the rising and to Emmet's leadership, if it can be called that, qualities that do not belong to them. That the government was momentarily alarmed only reveals its own character and does not make the fiasco in Thomas Street any less a fiasco. The abstract merits of Emmet's "plan" are meaningless because the rising was mismanaged, or rather, not managed at all. In short, as Ó Broin finally admits, Emmet was not competent to lead a revolution. Nevertheless, he became a "symbol" of patriotism and an inspiration to later Irishmen, and the subject of several superficial biographies. (CARL B. CONE)

Power, Edward J. *Education for American Democracy: An Introduction to Education.* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1958. Pp. xiv, 415. $5.75.)

In this first volume of the new McGraw-Hill Catholic Series in Education, Dr. Power sweepingly yet judiciously presents an enlightening summary of the history, ideals, organization, and administration of education in the United States: nursery school to graduate level, public, private, and parochial. His section on "Contemporary Issues and Special Problems" (pp. 275-368) probes in a skillful and fair manner such sensitive areas as "Conflicting Theories of Education" and "The Role of Religion in Democratic Education," often utilizing long quotations from primary sources. The author's earlier discussion of federal aid (pp. 110-115) overlooks the degree of governmental control that has manifested itself in the history of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 (vocational education), and fails to investigate education in the territories, presumably one of our best examples of total federal aid in action. The publishers seem to have omitted the eighth of the ten imperative needs of modern youth (p. 189). The end papers of this sturdily bound text are concise tables neatly presenting a useful array of data on educational history and leaders, and the book is further enriched by the inclusion of numerous attractive pictures, several pages of which are grouped at the beginning of each of the book's four sections, stimulating study questions and bibliographies at the end of each chapter, a good index, and an appendix which contains the texts of eight historic Supreme Court decisions in educational matters. The over-all historical and philosophical treatment of the material presented makes this book an excellent initial volume in the McGraw-Hill series, and should prove valuable to all students and teachers of education. In fine, Dr. Power's work represents the type of objective study that Catholic institutions of the better type are producing these days. (John Whitney Evans)

Renold, P. (Ed.). *The Wisbech Stirs (1595-1598).* [Volume LI, Publications of the Catholic Record Society.] (London: Catholic Record Society, 1958. Pp. xxix, 347.)

During the second half of the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, Wisbech Castle was used by the government as a prison for a number of recusants, mainly secular priests. In the course of the 1590's the prisoners formed themselves into two factions, one under the leadership of Dr. Christopher Bagshaw, a secular priest, the other under the leadership of Father William Weston, a Jesuit. When the conduct of Bagshaw's group made peaceful relations between the two impossible, Weston's following withdrew and attempted to live a common life in a separate section of the castle. These quarrels, which lasted in their most virulent form from 1595 to 1598, soon became known to the faithful as the Wisbech Stirs.

Taken by themselves, the Stirs would hardly seem to warrant a separate volume in the important series published by the Catholic Record Society. In their best light they would seem to be the unfortunate but understandable result of the hardships of prison life; in their worst light they would seem to be a disgraceful failure of Christian charity. However, it is the contention of Miss Renold, the editor, that the Wisbech Stirs are of much greater significance than this. She feels that they are part of a conspiracy on the part of several secular priests in England, Flanders, and Rome to discredit the Jesuits and have them removed from the English mission. In addition, she believes there is a direct connection, both in personnel and ideas, between the Stirs on the one hand and the later appellants and the Archpriest Controversy on the other.

Miss Renold here presents thirty-eight documents, twenty-five of which are from Bishop Bancroft's collection. By means of excellent introductions and notes she shows these documents in such a light that it is difficult not to agree with her as to the real significance of the affair. Future students of the Church's history during the period will have to make extensive use of them. The volume has the additional merit of possessing an excellent index. (Edward F. Wall, Jr.)

Stavrianos, L. S. *The Balkans Since 1453.* (New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc. 1958. Pp. xxi, 970. $12.00.)

Professor Stavrianos offers us a large sprawling book about the Balkans (including Rumania but not Hungary) in which he attempts to combine local and imperial approaches to the history of the peninsula since 1453. In this he is modestly successful but the cumulative effect favors the national units as the foci of the narrative. Inevitably this gives the book the appearance of being a compound of several national histories, especially from 1815 to 1950, the period to which three-quarters of the volume is devoted. The insertion of an occasional chapter on the dynamics of Balkan politics is the device used to provide an integrating factor. However effective this may be, it does little to enliven the narrative. But let it be said immediately that the book has several strong features. The annotated bibliography is probably, as the dust jacket claims, the most comprehensive published in a work on the Balkans. The sections on Greece reveal a good command of the information while the analysis of recent international events shows a careful perusal of the secondary materials. The footnoting is timely but could be more informative. I unsuccessfully pursued an *op. cit.* footnote through seven chapters before giving up, exhausted!

Minor errors mar the account. Stavrianos has the Mongol conqueror, Genghis Khan, charging about Asia Minor long after that worthy had died (p. 35). The Byzantines were not considered heretics by the Western Church (p. 40). It is laughable to compare the Moslem Institution to Scholasticism (p. 88). On almost all western mediaeval questions he takes positions which have been pretty thoroughly demolished. Dr. Stavrianos' judgments are based on the conventionalities of secular thought and he cannot find much sympathy for the Church, the "Green" revolution, or any "backward" elements. Yet, when he does have the necessary information in hand he tries hard, albeit unsuccessfully, to render justice to people and movements with whom he does not sympathize. (JOHN J. KAMERICK)

STERLING, RICHARD W. *Ethics in a World of Power: The Political Ideas of Friedrich Meinecke.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1958. Pp. xi, 318. $6.00.)

To those who find the search for meaning in history a fascinating avocation, this absorbing study of the political thought of Friedrich Meinecke will be a true delight. Professor Sterling has skillfully interwoven the intellectual growth and development of the dean of German historians with the external history of the twentieth century. The relationship thus demonstrated is the focal point of the study; Meinecke's gradual abandonment of a nation-centered treatment of history for the broader stage of international politics and its relevant ethical problems paralleled the defeat of Germany in two world wars and the consequent attempts to build a new international order.

Through the very clear and arresting style of Professor Sterling one watches the intellectual processes of the historian at work; the new insights which Meinecke received from contemporary events led him to discard certain theories, to salvage bits of his earlier views, and to reconcile his concept of man's fundamental drives with new power situations. The central problem of "ethics" in "a world of power" is subordinated all the way through to the elaboration of Meinecke's personal struggle to formulate a valid philosophy of history. Basing his story on all of Meinecke's writings, of which he shows profound knowledge, Sterling uses as a sort of substructure for his analysis the comparison of Meinecke's thought with that of Machiavelli. In the opinion of the reviewer, this is an excellent device, for it indicates at once the continuity of thought in modern times and the increasing difficulties attendant upon the search for a true relationship between ethics and political realities.

The final chapter in the book, entitled "Primacy of the Individual," is very significant, for one can see in it Meinecke's justification of his own resolute opposition to the Hitler regime despite his dedication to the

German state and his belief in the unique glory of German culture. In his elevation of "conscience to the position of supreme criterion in terms of which all human values had only relative claims to allegiance," Meinecke may well have given an authentic first principle to all those who resist tyranny for the sake of conscience. Surely, here is a political thinker of tremendous importance for contemporary times. A final word of praise is due to Professor Sterling for his excellent bibliography, his limited but helpful index, and for his placing the footnotes where this reviewer, at least, likes to find them. (MOTHER MARY ALICE GALLIN)

TIBESAR, ANTONINE, O.F.M. (Ed.). *Studies Presented at the Conference on the History of Religion in the New World during Colonial Times.* (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History. 1958. Pp. 210. $5.00.)

These essays are uneven in quality, in scope, and in length. The first two, dealing with religion in English America, are the most satisfactory; the second relates to the first as a commentary, the author posing objections to certain theses in the first study and offering alternate interpretations. The remaining ten essays are separate studies unrelated one to another. The consequence is that statements made in one paper may be contradicted in another. In "Religion in French America" Father Maheux says, "The Council of Trent is of major importance for the understanding of religion in the first settlers. Its decrees were immediately accepted in Italy, Spain, and Portugal by the state and clergy" (p. 101). Professor Ricard states in his essay on Portuguese and Spanish America, "The development of the secular clergy came about very gradually and slowly . . . in Spain itself the reforms of the Council of Trent were introduced very late and the creation of Tridentine seminaries was not had until the reign of Charles III" (p. 112).

Dr. Walsh's study, "A Survey of Canadian Church History," contains many general assertions; the reader senses the need for greater factual support. The following paragraph is typical:

> For a brief period the Jesuits' dominance was successfully challenged by the Sulpicians of Montreal, but this formidable threat was partially overcome when the Jesuits secured in 1659 a bishop for Quebec, who had been thoroughly steeped in the principles of the Society of Jesus at the Hermitage of Caen. They also achieved the almost impossible by having him consecrated outside the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the French church and thus saved him from an oath which would have required him to uphold the Four Articles of Gallican liberties, in which the authority of the papacy in relation to the Church in France had been severely curtailed (p. 28).

While a question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction did arise between Bishop Laval and the Abbé de Queylus, grand vicar of the Sulpicians in Canada, the difficulty was duly resolved and Bishop Laval appointed de Queylus his grand vicar at Montreal. Since Laval, as a priest in France, had pursued a mode of spirituality akin to that followed by M. Olier, founder of the Sulpicians, it would seem likely that the Sulpicians in Canada would enjoy his approval, as did the Jesuits, who taught the young Laval at La Flêche and at the Collège de Clermont in Paris. The influence of the Hermitage of Caen, where Laval resided between 1655 and 1658, would scarcely be formative since Laval was then a mature man; furthermore, the spiritual director of the hermitage, M. de Bernières, was not a Jesuit. Bishop Laval was consecrated on December 8, 1658, by the nuncio Piccolomini in the abbatial Church of St. Germain-des-Près in Paris and took, before his departure to the new world, the customary oath of fidelity to the king. The Gallican privileges, although they had a long history in French Church-State relations, were not reduced to the famous Four Articles until 1682.

Valuable information is given by Professor Ribeiro on the infiltration of African folklore and religious customs into the Christian practices of Negroes baptized in Portuguese America. Professor Gonsalves de Mello disabuses us of the notion that religious toleration prevailed in the Dutch ruled areas of northeast Brazil, 1630-1654. Count Maurice of Nassau wanted to espouse the cause of toleration, but he reflected in this attitude neither the wishes of the Calvinists among the Dutch settlers nor the views of their religionists in the States General of the United Provinces, whose spirit of intolerance prevailed in colonial policy.

We have reason to be grateful to the Academy of American Franciscan History for sharing these *Studies* with us. They are valuable precis achieved by competent historians; they fulfill the object of the conference, viz., "to study the problem of writing a history of religion in the New World during Colonial Times." (SISTER MARY CRESCENTIA THORNTON)

WHALEN, WILLIAM J. *Christianity and American Freemasonry.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1958. Pp. ix, 195. $3.75.)

There are three major areas to be considered in any treatment of Freemasonry in the United States. The first is Freemasonry as a religion with its own doctrine, system of morals and oaths, and its ritual and ceremonies which borrow freely from the churches and religions of the world. The second is Freemasonry in relationship to the United States, not only in its legal structure but as well in its spirit and genius. Where does this secret society with its esoteric meetings, its restrictions against certain groups of people, the closed door type of operation, fit into the American picture? The third is Freemasonry and its opposition to the Catholic Church in the United States, an opposition that is exaggerated by some and minimized by others.

This formidable task is carried out admirably by the author of this volume. Furthermore, it is about time that Freemasonry not be treated as a "sacred cow" beyond research or criticism by Catholics. In recent years several books purported to treat of Catholics in the American scene, and by a strange coincidence, although all manner of relationships of Catholics to their fellow-citizens was treated, e.g., in education, race problems, politics, religion, etc., none gave any notice at all to Freemasonry.

The treatment and tone of Mr. Whalen's book are excellent, descending only very slightly at times to some tendentiousness, somehow rather easily excusable. The good faith attributed by the author to members of the Blue Lodges "who have never heard one word against the Church" at meetings; the separation of the Master Masons from the Scottish Rite members so violently anti-Catholic, are well taken. Later editions of this book will have to incorporate certain modifications in the assertion that the Grand Lodges of each state forbid religion and politics in lodge meetings. There is one recent exception, the Grand Lodge of California, which changed its by-laws in order to participate directly in the November, 1958, elections with men and lodge funds in opposition to the Catholic schools. But even here a rigid distinction must be kept between head and members, between official policy and actual practice by members of the crafts. Calm research into the dogma and methods of American secret societies is very much in order and long overdue. (MARK J. HURLEY)

WILKINS, ERNEST HATCH. *Petrarch's Eight Years in Milan.* [Mediaeval Academy of America, Publication No. 69.] (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1958. Pp. xx, 266. $8.00.)

This handsomely printed and discouragingly expensive book is essentially a continuation of the author's earlier, *Studies in the Life and Works of Petrarch* (Cambridge, 1955), or rather of that section of the latter book called "Petrarch in Provence, 1351-1353." Like "Petrarch in Provence," this latest work is an effort to construct a *Jahrbuch*—perhaps we should call it a *Tagebuch*—in which all of Petrarch's activities, private, political, and literary, are listed in chronological order on a month-by-month, where possible even on a day-by-day, basis. A short introductory "Summary of Petrarch's Life and Work before Coming to Milan," and a similar concluding "Summary of Petrarch's Life and Work after Leaving Milan" (somewhat illogically appearing as Chapter 26 rather than as an epilogue) provide context. The utility and value of this work for scholars specializing in Petrarch could hardly be exaggerated. Professor Wilkins has woven into this book exhaustive discussions on the large and small problems of Petrarch's life and works, with which long years of intensive research and warm sympathy with his subject have given him intimate familiarity. This book, like its predecessor "Petrarch in Provence," is virtually a huge set of erudite footnotes to the works of Petrarch, and no one will want to read that celebrated humanist without having these works convenient for reference. On the other hand, I do not anticipate that this book would appeal to a very wide or popular audience. Most non-specialist readers will derive from it the impression of reading footnotes without the texts that make the footnotes meaningful. Undoubtedly, however, it will provide a foundation upon which, in the future, many more popular treatments of Petrarch will be built. (DAVID HERLIHY)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

GENERAL

Philosophie ou théologie de l'histoire? A. de Bovis, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* May, 1959).

Reading, Writing, and History. J. A. Lukacs (*American Heritage,* June, 1959).

Ancient Historians and "Enlightened" Reviewers. Charles Mullett (*Review of Politics,* July, 1959).

Natura e portata del Primato del Romano Pontefice secondo il Concilio Vaticano. (*continua*). Umberto Betti, O.F.M. (*Antonianum,* Apr.-July, 1959).

The Changing Image of Catholicism in America. Robert D. Cross (*Yale Review,* Summer, 1959).

Il concetto giuridico di sovranità nel Diritto ecclesiastico e civile. Giuseppe di Mattia, O.F.M. Conv. (*Miscellanea Francescana,* Oct.-Dec., 1958).

Nine Centuries of Schism. Patrick O'Connell (*Studies,* Summer, 1959).

Darwinism and America. Vincent C. Hopkins (*Thought,* Summer, 1959).

Christian Thought and the Thought of Modern Science. Frank Nelson Gardner (*Encounter,* Winter, 1959).

Ignaz von Doellinger: Lord Acton's Mentor. Stephen Tonsor (*Anglican Theological Review,* July, 1959).

The Oecumenical Council. Bede Winslow (*Eastern Churches Quarterly,* Spring, 1959).

Catholicism in Ethiopia. P. H. Sprenger (*Eastern Churches Quarterly,* Spring, 1959).

A Century of Darwinism in Biology. Alexander Wolsky (*Thought,* Summer, 1959).

Historicismo y ciencia política en Meinecke. Luis Díez del Corral (*Revista de Estudios Politicos,* Sept.-Oct., 1958).

Pragmatism as a Theory of Historical Knowledge: John Dewey on the Nature of Historical Inquiry. Burleigh Taylor Wilkins (*American Historical Review,* July, 1959).

Das Kirchliche Amt in katholischer Sicht. Joseph Lortz (*Una Sancta,* May, 1959).

A Checklist of the Vatican Manuscript Codices Available for Consultation at the Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University: Part VIII. (*Manuscripta,* July, 1959).

Progress of the Oecumenical Movement. Stephen J. Brown (*Studies,* Summer, 1959).

Zur Problematik der amerikanischen Missionsgeschichte. Joh. Beckmann, S.M.B. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft. Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire,* Fasc. 2, 1959).

The Case for Internal Evidence (8) Salmons in Both, or Some Caveats for Canonical Scholars. Ephim G. Fogel (*Bulletin of the New York Public Library,* June, 1959). (Part II.)

Some Relations between the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches. Duncan Van Dusen (*Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church,* Mar., 1959).

Darwin's Impact on Philosophy. James Collins (*Thought,* Summer, 1959).

Coleridge on Science, Philosophy and Poetry: Their Relation to Religion. Lucyle Werkmeister (*Harvard Theological Review,* Apr., 1959).

Writings on the History of Religion in the United States, 1958. Edward R. Vollmar (*Manuscripta,* July, 1959).

ANTIQUITY

The Greek Inscriptions of the Jews of Rome. Harry J. Leon (*Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies,* Jan., 1959).

The Semitic Background of the NT *Mysterion* (II). R. E. Brown (*Biblica,* Fasc. 1, 1959).

La Conception johannique de la foi. A Decourtray (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* June, 1959).

The Text of Romans and 1 Corinthians in Minuscule 93 and the Text of Pamphilus. Harold S. Murphy (*Harvard Theological Review,* Apr., 1959).

Nationalism and Internationalism in the Early Church. Robert M. Grant (*Anglican Theological Review,* July, 1959).

Une nouvelle Vie de Constantin dans un légendier de Patmos. François Halkin (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Fasc. I-II, 1959).

The Origins of Arianism. T. E. Pollard (*Journal of Theological Studies,* IX, 1958).

De authenticitate et sensu quarumdam epistularum S. Basilio et Apollinario Laodiceno adscriptarum *(continuatio et finis)*. Reinoldus Weijenborg, O.F.M. (*Antonianum,* Apr.-July, 1959).

Il culto delle Reliquie nell' antichità riflesso nei due termini "Patrocinia" e "Pignora." Giuseppe Gagov, O.F.M. Conv. (*Miscellanea Francescana,* Oct.-Dec., 1958).

La Légende de sainte Barbe par Jean de Wackerzeele. Baudouin de Gaiffier (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Fasc. I-II, 1959).

Papst Agapet I und Kaiser Justinian I. W. Ensslin (*Historisches Jahrbuch,* No. *77,* 1958).

MEDIAEVAL

The Canterbury Edition of the Answers of Pope Gregory I to St. Augustine. Margaret Deanesly and Paul Grosjean, S. J., Bollandiste (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1959).

The Rites for the Dying in the Early Middle Ages. I. H. B. Porter (*Journal of Theological Studies,* Apr., 1959).

Quelques recueils d'écrits attribués à Hugues de Saint-Victor. O. Lottin, O.S.B. (*Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médièvale,* July-Dec., 1958).

Adhemar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics. James A. Brundage (*Speculum,* Apr., 1959).

A Forged Charter of Henry II for Bival. Joseph R. Strayer (*Speculum,* Apr., 1959).

University Clerks and Rolls of Petitions for Benefices. Donald E. R. Watt (*Speculum,* Apr., 1959).

The University of Cambridge and the Great Schism. Walter Ullmann (*Journal of Theological Studies,* IX, 1958).

El horario de trabajo del concilio de Ferrara-Florencia. Félix Rodríguez (*Estudios Eclesiasticos,* Apr.-June, 1959).

England's First Attempt to Break the Commercial Monopoly of the Hanseatic League, 1377-1380. Hyman Palais (*American Historical Review,* July, 1959).

The Commissary of the Bishop in the Diocese of Lincoln. Colin Morris (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1959).

Forerunners of the Franciscans: The Waldenses. Berard Marthaler, O.F.M. Conv. (*Franciscan Studies,* June, 1958).

De divini officii celebratione iuxta Regulam et legislationem Ordinis Fratrum Minorum. Bartholomaeus Joseph Belluco, O.F.M. (*Antonianum,* Apr.-July, 1959).

El derecho de espolio en Pamplona en el siglo XIV. José Goñi Gaztambide (*Hispania Sacra,* No. 21, 1958).

La Iglesia española ante la caída del Imperio latino de Constantinopla. D. Eloy Benito Ruano (*Hispania Sacra,* No. 21, 1958).

El tipo ideal de obispo en la Iglesia española antes de la rebelión luterana. R. P. Tarsicio de Azcona, O.F.M. Cap. (*Hispania Sacra,* No. 21, 1958).

Primeros Estatutos del Colegio español de San Clemente en Bolonia. Vicente Beltrán de Heredia, O.P. (*Hispania Sacra,* No. 21, 1958).

La Iglesia española y el concubinato hasta el siglo X. Antonio Mostaza Rodríguez (*Anthologica Annua,* 6, 1958).

Inicios del *Hospitale Cathalanorum et Aragonensium* en Roma. Johannes Vincke (*Hispania Sacra,* No. 21, 1958).

Las ordenaciones urbanas de Perpiñán en 1409. Pedro Voltes Bou (*Pirineos,* Jan.-Dec., 1957).

De Barcelone a Toulouse: échanges et rencontres dans la peinture médiévale. Robert Mesuret (*Pirineos,* Jan.-Dec., 1957).

The Chalice of Sisinios, the Grand Logothete. Marvin C. Ross (*Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies,* Jan., 1959).

Medical Illustrations in Medieval Manuscripts of the Vatican Library (Concluded). Loren C. MacKinney (*Manuscripta,* July, 1959).

LATE RENAISSANCE AND MODERN

Three Sixteenth-Century Scottish Missals. William James Anderson (*Innes Review,* Autumn, 1958).

Two Necrologies of Scottish Benedictine Abbeys in Germany. Mark Dilworth, O.S.B. (*Innes Review,* Autumn, 1958).

The Earl of Essex and Ireland, 1599. L. W. Henry (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* May, 1959).

Parochial Curates in Elizabethan London. H. Gareth Owen (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1959).

John Gerard and the Gunpowder Plot. A. F. Allison (*Recusant History,* Apr., 1959).

The Writings of Father Luke Wadding, O.F.M. Canice Mooney, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies,* Sept.-Dec., 1958).

Richard Verstegan and Catholic Martyrologies of the Later Elizabethan Period. A. G. Petti (*Recusant History,* Apr., 1959).

Episcopacy and a 'Godly Discipline,' 1641-6. W. M. Lamont (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1959).

The Master and the Dean. John B. Morrall (*Studies,* Summer, 1959).

Notes sur quelques sources des *Antiquitates* de Jacques Ussher. Édition de la *Vita Commani.* Paul Grosjean (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Fasc. I-II, 1959).

Hispana et Lusitana. Baudouin de Gaiffier (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Fasc. I-II, 1959).

Franciscanismo de Isabel la Católica. Juan Meseguer Fernández, O.F.M. (*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Jan.-June, 1959).

Diego de Arnedo, obispo de Mallorca, reformador tridentino (Datos para una biografía). Lorenzo Pérez Martínez (*Anthologica Annua,* 6, 1958).

Esfuerzos y tentativas del Conde-Duque de Olivares para exonerar de los espolios y vacantes a los prelados hispanos. Nicolás García Martín (*Anthologica Annua,* 6, 1958).

Manrique de Rojas' Report on French Settlement in Florida, 1564. Lucy L. Wenhold (*Florida Historical Quarterly,* July, 1959).

Le missioni di A. Possevino in Piemonte. Propaganda calvinista e restaurazione cattolica. 1560-1563. Mario Scaduto, S.J. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu,* Jan.-June, 1959).

Santiago de los Españoles, de Roma, en el siglo XVI. Justo Fernández Alonso (*Anthologica Annua,* 6, 1958).

El P. Alonso Muñoz, misionero y diplomático. Antolín Abad, O.F.M. (*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Jan.-June, 1959).

Sel. Sebastian Kimura (1565-1622). Der erste japanische Priester. Hubert Cieslik, S.J. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft. Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire,* Fasc. 2, 1959).

The First Chinese Priest of the Society of Jesus. Emmanuel de Siqueira. Cheng Ma-no Wei-hsin. 1633-1673. Francis J. Rouleau, S.J. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu,* Jan.-June, 1959).

Brevia dicta de historia polonica et de nostris in Polonia, 1807-1847. Josephus Löw (*Spicilegium Historicum,* Fasc. 1, 1959).

Redemptoristae in Polonia dispersi post suppressionem conventus S. i Bennonis an. 1808. Carolus Szrant (*Spicilegium Historicum,* Fasc. 1, 1959).

Epistularum commercium inter Patres CSSR in Italia et trans Alpes tempore S.i Clementis, 1786-1820. Andreas Sampers (*Spicilegium Historicum,* Fasc. 1, 1959).

El *Tratado de la Regalia de amortización* de Campomanes y el primer proyecto de ley general de Amortización a través de los despachos de la Nunciatura. Justo Fernández Alonso (*Hispania Sacra,* No. 21, 1958).

El P. Pedro Gil, S.J. (1622) y su colección de Vidas de Santos. Ángel Fábrega Grau (*Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia,* Vol. XXXI, No. 1, 1958).

El antiguo Colegio mayor de San Vicente Ferrer y San Ramón de Penyafort, de Barcelona. José M.ª Coll, O.P. (*Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia,* Vol. XXXI, No. 1, 1958).

Influencia de la Universidad de Salamanca en la de Lérida. Ramón Gaya Massot (*Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia,* Vol. XXXI, No. 1, 1958).

Three Friars, a Queen and a Cardinal and New Spain. *(to be continued)* Stephen A. Janto, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies,* June, 1958).

Three Friars, a Queen and a Cardinal and New Spain *(end).* Stephen A. Janto, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies,* Sept.-Dec., 1958).

AMERICAN

Of Raleigh and the First Plantation. (The Elizabethans and America: Part II.) A. L. Rowse (*American Heritage,* June, 1959).

Colonial Philosophy. Vincent Buranelli (*William and Mary Quarterly,* July, 1959).

The Humble Immigrant and the American Dream: Some Case Histories, 1746-1776. Catherine S. Crary (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* June, 1959).

The American Character: A Frenchman Views the New Republic from Philadelphia, 1777. Durand Echeverria (*William and Mary Quarterly,* July, 1959).

John Dickinson, Historical Revolutionary. H. Trevor Colbourn (*Pennsylvania Magazine,* July, 1959).

Father Gabriel Richard. Stanley Pargellis (*Michigan History,* June, 1959).

The Failure of the American Abolitionists. Merton L. Dillon (*Journal of Southern History,* May, 1959).

New York's Bloodiest Week. Lawrence Lader (*American Heritage,* June. 1959).

Campaigning with Sheridan: A Farrier's Diary. George H. Shirk (*Chronicles of Oklahoma,* Spring, 1959).

Copperheads and Copperheadism in Wisconsin: Democratic Opposition to the Lincoln Administration. Frank L. Klement (*Wisconsin Magazine of History,* Spring, 1959).

Early Churches of Pensacola. Lelia Abercrombie (*Florida Historical Quarterly,* Jan.-Apr., 1959).

The Shaker Community in Florida. Russell H. Anderson (*Florida Historical Quarterly,* July, 1959).

New Mexico Viewed by Americans 1846-1849. John P. Bloom (*New Mexico Historical Review,* July, 1959).

The Last of the Bosses. Francis Russell (*American Heritage,* June, 1959).

William Seton: A Catholic Darwinist. John L. Morrison (*Review of Politics,* July, 1959).

François de Laval. Jean-Marie Fortier (*Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique Française,* June, 1959).

Essai sur les finances canadiennes (1700-1750).(suite). Guy Frégault (*Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique Française,* June, 1959).

The British Conquest: Canadian Social Scientists and the Fate of the Canadiens. Michel Brunet (*Canadian Historical Review,* June, 1959).

The American Revolution and the Beauce, Québec: 1775-1783. John E. Hare (*Culture,* June, 1959).

The Italians in New Mexico. Frederick G. Bohme (*New Mexico Historical Review,* Apr., 1959).

Aux origines d'un schisme—Le Centenaire d'une réconciliation avortée . . . (suite). W. J. Price (*Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique Française,* June, 1959).

Thoreau and French Canada. Lawrence Wilson (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* July-Sept., 1959).

Documentación americana en el Archivo General O.F.M. de Roma. Pedro Borges, O.F.M. (*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Jan.-June, 1959).

Aristóteles e os índios americanos: um estudo de preconceito de raça no Mundo Moderno. Lewis Hanke (*Revista de História,* Jan.-Mar., 1959).

Origem e fundaçáo do Serviço de Proteção aos índios. David Hall Stauffer (*Revista de História,* Jan.-Mar., 1959).

Bibliography of Sources for Contemporary Mexican History. Stanley Robert Ross (*Hahr,* May, 1959).

Dos misioneros franciscanos hermanos en el Colegio de Chillán (Chile). Arcángel Barrado, O.F.M. (*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Jan.-June, 1959).

Una investigación sobre los problemas del trabajo en Chile durante el período colonial. Alvaro Jara (*Hahr,* May, 1959).

Esbôço Histórico da Capitania de S. Vicente no Século XVI através do Epistolário dos Jesuítas. Manuel Xavier de Vasconcelos Pedrosa (*Revista do Instito Histórico e Geográfico de São Paulo,* Vol. LV, 1959).

El Humboldt que vio Colombia. E. Pérez Arbeláez (*Revista Javeriana,* May, 1959).

Nuestra Señora de la Macana. Angelico Chavez (*New Mexico Historical Review,* Apr., 1959).

CONTEMPORARY

Irish Economic Expansion. David O'Mahony (*Studies,* Summer, 1959).

El Cardenal Crisanto Luque. José Restrepo Posada (*Revista Javeriana,* June, 1959).

Perón and After, Part II. (Conclusion) Fritz L. Hoffmann (*Hahr,* May, 1959).

El futuro político del Japón. Seizo Ohe (*Revista de Estudios Politicos,* Sept.-Oct., 1958).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Atti del XXXV Congresso di storia del risorgimento Italiano. Vol. III. (Roma: Istituto per la storia del risorgimento Italiano. 1959. Pp. xxix, 374.)

Attwater, Donald. *St. John Chrysostom. Pastor and Preacher.* (London: Harvill Press. 1959. Pp. x, 191. 18s. net.) Originally published in the United States in 1939.

Bailey, James Henry II. *History of St. Peter's Church, Richmond, Virginia.* (Richmond: St. Peter's Church. 1959. Pp. 81.) This well documented brochure recounts the 125 eventful years of Richmond's first cathedral church. In addition to pictures of the various bishops there is an appendix containing useful data on the pastors and assistants of St. Peter's, the early baptisms, etc.

Baldwin, John W. *The Medieval Theories of the Just Price. Romanists, Canonists, and Theologians in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries.* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society. 1959. Pp. 92. $2.00.)

Barker, Burt Brown. *The McLoughlin Empire and Its Rulers. Doctor John McLoughlin; Doctor David McLoughlin; Marie Louise (Sister St. Henry).* (Glendale: Arthur H. Clark Co. 1959. Pp. 370. $12.50.)

Becker, Otto. *Bismarcks Ringen um Deutschlands Gestaltung. Herausgegeben und erganzt von Alexander Scharff.* (Heidelberg: Verlag Quelle & Meyer. 1958. Pp. 963. DM 58.–.)

Beik, Paul H., and Laurence Lafore. *Modern Europe. A History since 1500.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., Inc. 1959. Pp. xviii, 1006. $7.95.)

Berlin, Isaiah. *Karl Marx. His Life and Environment.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1959. Pp. 280. $1.50.) A reprint as a Galaxy Book from the second edition of 1948; originally published in 1939.

Bibliographia Franciscana. Vol. X. *Principaliora Complectens Opera Annis 1951-1953. Edita N. 1922-4724. Collectanea Franciscana.* (Roma: Instituto Storico dei Fr. Minori Cappuccini. 1958. Pp. 1022.)

Blinzler, Josef. Translated by Isabel and Florence McHugh. *The Trial of Jesus.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1959. Pp. xi, 312. $4.75.)

Brodie, Bernard. *Strategy in the Missile Age.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1959. Pp. vii, 423. $6.50.)

Brooke, Rosaline B. *Early Franciscan Government. Elias to Bonaventure.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1959. Pp. xv, 313. $7.50.)

Bruckberger, R. L. *Image of America.* (New York: Viking Press, Inc. 1959. Pp. ix, 277. $4.50.)

Busch, Noel F. *Thailand. An Introduction to Modern Siam.* (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1959. Pp. ix, 166. $3.50.)

Callis, Helmut G. *China. Confucian and Communist.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1959. Pp. xiii, 562. $6.50.) A Holt-Dryden Book by the professor of history in the University of Utah which traces China's story from c. 2000 B.C. to the present with almost half the volume devoted to Communism in China; equipped with bibliographical notes by chapters, the text of certain key documents, a chronological survey, maps, and index.

Carthy, Mother Mary Peter, O.S.U. *English Influences on Early American Catholicism.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1959. Pp. viii, 147. $1.75.) A Ph.D. dissertation.

Ceplecha, Christian, O.S.B. *The Historical Thought of José Ortega y Gasset.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1958. Pp. xvi, 182. $2.00.) A Ph.D. dissertation.

Commentarii Laurentiani Historici. Quarto Revoluto Saeculo ab ortu S. Laurentii Brundusini, Novi Ecclesiae Doctoris. Collectanea Franciscana. Tomus 29, 1949. Fasc. 2-4. (Roma: Instituto Storico dei Fr. Minori Cappuccini. 1959. Pp. 579. $6.50.)

Congrès de Droit Canonique Médiéval. (Louvain: Editions Nauwelaerts. 1959. Pp. viii, 183. FB 260.)

Couch, H. N. *Cicero on the Art of Growing Old.* (Providence: Brown University Press. N. Devon, England: Arthur H. Stockwell, Ltd. 1959. Pp. xv, 112. $2.00.)

Daniel-Rops, H. Translated by Audrey Butler. *The Church in the Dark Ages.* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc. 1959. Pp. xi, 624. $10.00.)

Davis, Edwin Adams. *Louisiana. The Pelican State.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1959. Pp. xi, 356. $4.95.)

Delacroix, S. (Ed.). *Les Missions Contemporaines, 1800-1957. L'Église Catholique Face un Monde non Chrétien.* Vol. IV. (Paris: Librairie Grund. 1959. Pp. 413.)

de Oveido, Gonzalo Fernández. Translated and edited by Sterling A. Stoudemire. *Natural History of the West Indies.* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1959. Pp. xvii, 140.)

De Santis, Vincent P. *Republicans Face the Southern Question. The New Departure Years, 1877-1897.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1959. Pp. 275, viii.) This volume is Number 1 in the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Series LXXVII.

Diamant, Alfred. *The Austrian Catholics and the Social Question, 1918-1933.* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press. 1959. Pp. 81. $2.00.)

Dickens, A. G. *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York, 1509-1558.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1959. Pp. 272. $4.80.)

Doublier, Gerda. *Maria Stuart. Ihr Leben als Königin und Frau.* (Wien: Hermann Bohlaus Nachf. 1959. Pp. 318. DM 16.50.)

Dovring, Karin. *Road of Propaganda: The Semantics of Biased Communication.* (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc. Pp. 158. $4.75.)

Duckett, Eleanor. *The Wandering Saints of the Early Middle Ages.* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc. 1959. Pp. 319. $5.00.)

Durkin, Joseph T. *General Sherman's Son. The Life of Thomas Ewing Sherman, S.J.* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy. 1959. Pp. ix, 276. $4.50.)

Fisher, E. A. *An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon Architecture and Sculpture.* (London: Faber and Faber. 1959. Pp. 104. $4.25.)

Fisher, Sydney Nettleton. *The Middle East. A History.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1959. Pp. xiv, 650. $8.95.)

Fourrey, René. *The Curé d'Ars. A Pictorial Biography.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1959. Pp. 215. $10.00.)

Gimpl, Sister M. Caroline Ann. *The Correspondant and the Founding of the French Third Republic.* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press. 1959. Pp. vii, 239. $2.50.) A Ph.D. dissertation.

Girou, Jean. *Saint Dominique. Révolutionnaire de Dieu.* (Paris: Editions Albin Michel. 1959. Pp. 280. 1,075 F.)

Guérard, Albert. *France. A Modern History.* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1959. Pp. xxiv, 563. $8.75.)

Hafen, Leroy R., and Ann W. *Relations with the Indians of the Plains, 1857-1861.* [The Far West and the Rockies Historical Series, 1820-1875. Vol. IX.] (Glendale: Arthur H. Clark Co. 1959. Pp. 310. $9.50.)

Handlin, Oscar. *Boston's Immigrants.* Revised and enlarged edition. (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 1959. Pp. xvii, 382. $6.75.)

Haring, C. H. *Empire in Brazil. A New World Experiment with Monarchy.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1958. Pp. 182. $4.00.)

Hawkes, Terence (Ed.). *Coleridge's Writings on Shakespeare.* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1959. Pp. 256. $2.50.) A selection from the essays, notes, and lectures of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, edited by a professor of the University of Buffalo with an introduction by Alfred Harbage.

Hayes, Louis D., Jr. (Ed.). *Teach the Freeman. The Correspondence of Rutherford B. Hayes and the Slater Fund for Negro Education, 1881-1887.* Vols. I and II. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1959. Pp. lv, 236; 302. $10.00 per set.)

Hughes, Paul L., Robert F. Fries. *Crown and Parliament in Tudor-Stuart England. A Documentary Constitutional History, 1485-1714.* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1959. Pp. xvi, 359. $6.95.)

Huthmacher, J. Joseph. *Massachusetts People and Politics, 1919-1933.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1959. Pp. x, 328. $6.50.)

Hutton, Edward. *Naples and Campania Revisited.* (London: Hollis & Carter; New York: David McKay Co., Inc. 1958. Pp. xii, 286. 30 s.)

Johnson, Peter Leo. *Crosier on the Frontier. A Life of John Martin Henni, Archbishop of Milwaukee.* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin. 1959. Pp. xiii, 240. $3.95.)

Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, 1756. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1959. Pp. ix, 248. $7.50.)

Knoles, George Harmon. *The New United States: A History since 1896.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1959. Pp. xvi, 650. $6.75.)

Knorr, Klaus (Ed.). *NATO and American Security.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1959. Pp. 342. $6.00.)

Korbel, Josef. *The Communist Subversion of Czechoslovakia, 1938-1948. The Failure of Coexistence.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1959. Pp. xii, 258. $5.00.)

La Farge, Oliver. *Santa Fe. The Autobiography of a Southwestern Town.* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1959. Pp. xviii, 436.)

Lawlor, Sister Mary, S.N.D. *Alexis de Tocqueville in the Chamber of Deputies. His Views on Foreign and Colonial Policy.* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press. 1959. Pp. xi, 201. $2.25.) A Ph.D. dissertation.

Le Saint, William P., S.J. Translator. *Tertullian. Treatises on Penance. On Penitence and on Purity.* [Ancient Christian Writers, Vol. 28.] (Westminster: Newman Press. 1959. Pp. vi, 330. $4.00.)

Lewis, D. B. Wyndham. *A Florentine Portrait: St. Philip Benizi.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1959. Pp. 137. $3.00.)

Loftis, John. *Comedy and Society from Congreve to Fielding.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1959. Pp. ix, 154. $4.00.)

Maritain, Jacques. *Distinguish to Unite or The Degrees of Knowledge.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1959. Pp. xix, 476. $7.50.) Newly translated from the fourth French edition under the supervision of Gerald B. Phelan.

Martin, Michael Rheta, and Geoffrey Brunn (Consulting Ed.). *A Graphic Guide to World History.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1959. Pp. 243. $2.75.) A most useful compendium of information on people and events from 3500 B.C. to the present. The stream of history is divided into nineteen periods, for each of which data are arranged in the same six double-page categories: a tabular overview, major trends, politics and war, social progress, intellectual progress, the arts. All geographical areas and all phases of life covered adequately; index; hard paper binding.

Matthews, George T. (Ed.). *News and Rumor in Renaissance Europe. The Fugger Newsletters. A Capricorn Book.* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1959. Pp. 253. $1.25.)

Malone, Dumas. (Introduction) *The Autobiography of Thomas Jefferson.* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1959. Pp. 119. $2.50.)

McNamee, Sister Mary Dominica, S.N.D. de N. *Williamette Interlude.* (Palo Alto: Pacific Books. 1959. Pp. xviii, 302. $4.50.)

Meehan, Denis (Ed.). *Adamnan's de Locis Sanctis.* Vol. III. *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae.* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies. 1958. Pp. 154. 30/–.)

Michonneau, Abbé. *My Father's Business. A Priest in France.* (New York: Herder and Herder, Inc. 1959. Pp. 154. $2.95.) By the author of *Revolution in a City Parish.*

Miller, John C. *Origins of the American Revolution.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press. Pp. xxii, 530. $7.50.) This edition of a work that appeared originally in 1943 has a new introduction and a bibliography.

Nevins, Albert J. *The Maryknoll Book of Peoples.* (New York: John J. Crawley & Co., Inc. 1959. Pp. 319. $4.95.)

Olmstead, Frederick Law. Edited by Harvey Wish. *The Slave States (Before the Civil War).* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1959. Pp. 255. $2.50.)

Pacelli, Francesco. *Diario della Conciliazione. Con verbali e appendice di documenti.* (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana. 1959. Pp. viii, 575. 3500 lire.)

Pacheco, Juan Manuel, S.J. *Los Jesuitas en Colombia.* Tomo I. *1567-1654.* (Bogotà, Colombia: San Juan Eudes. 1959. Pp. 622.)

Palmer, L. E. *Man's Journey Through Time. A First Step in Physical and Cultural Anthropology.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1959. Pp. xv, 184.) The text of this work by the professor emeritus in the University of Hull, who is also honorary curator of Wells Museum, Somerset, has been enriched by fifty-five illustrations and nine tables.

Palmer, R. R. *The Age of the Democratic Revolution. A Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800. The Challenge.* Vol. I. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1959. Pp. ix, 534. $7.50.)

Perry, Richard L. (Ed.), John C. Cooper (Supervisor). *Sources of Our Liberties. Documentary Origins of Individual Liberties in the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights.* (New York: New York University Press, for the American Bar Foundation. 1959. Pp. xxii, 456. $5.00.)

Petri, Barbara Patricia. *The Historical Thought of P. J. B. Buchez.* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press. 1958. Pp. vii, 133. $1.50.) A Ph.D. dissertation.

Preliminary Guide to the Research Materials of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. 1959. Pp. v, 58. 50¢.)

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society at the Annual Meeting Held in Worcester, October 15, 1958. (Worcester: Published by the Society. 1959. Pp. 163-360.)

Report on the Public Archives for the Years 1955-1958. (Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery. 1959. Pp. 63. 50¢.)

Reynolds, James A. (Ed.). *Historical Records and Studies.* Vol. XLVI. (New York: United States Catholic Historical Society. 1958. Pp. 158.)

Ricciotti, Giuseppe. *The Age of Martyrs.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1959. Pp. viii, 305. $4.95.)

Rice, Sister M. Elizabeth Ann, O.P. *The Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Mexico, as Affected by the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Mexico, 1925-1929.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1959. Pp. vii, 224. $2.50.) A Ph.D. dissertation.

Ridolfi, Roberto. Translated by Cecil Grayson. *The Life of Girolamo Savonarola.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1959. Pp. x, 325. $7.50.)

Riley, Stephen T., Director. *The Massachusetts Historical Society, 1791-1959.* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1959. Pp. 62. $1.25.) The director of the oldest historical society in the country (1791) gives in this attractive brochure a brief sketch of its history, collections, and publications with a final word on the future role of the society. There are twenty some illustrations along with the text.

Roberts, Michael (Ed.). *Historical Studies: II. Papers read to the Third Conference of Irish Historians by Denys Hays, et al.* (London: Bowes and Bowes, Ltd. 1959. Pp. 88. 10s *6d* net.)

Rommerskirchen, Giovanni, O.M.I. (Compiler). *Bibliografia Missionaria* Anno. XXII: *1958*. (Roma: Pontificia Biblioteca Missionaria Di Prop. Fide. 1959. Pp. 123.)

Rowland, Buford, Handy B. Fant, and Harold E. Hufford (Compilers). *Records of the United States House of Representatives, 1789-1946.* No. 113. Vols. I, II. Preliminary Inventories, Record Group 233. (Washington: National Archives and Records Service. General Services Administration. 1959. Pp. vi, 292; 587.)

Rubin, Louis, Jr. *Teach the Freeman.* Vols. I and II. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1959. Pp. lv, 236; 301. $10.00 set.)

Saggi Storici Intorno al Papato dei. Professori della Facoltà di Storia Ecclesiastica. Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae. Vol. XXI (Roma: Pontificia Universita Gregoriana. 1959. Pp. xx, 480.)

Sarton, George. *A History of Science. Hellenistic Science and Culture in the Last Three Centuries B.C.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1959. Pp. xxvi, 554. $11.00.)

Scullard, H. H. *From the Gracchi to Nero. A History of Rome from 133 B.C. to A.D. 68.* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. 1959. Pp. xi, 450. $6.00.)

Sievers, Harry J. *Benjamin Harrison. Hoosier Statesman. From the Civil War to the White House, 1865-1888.* (New York: University Publishers, Inc. 1959. Pp. xxi, 502. $6.00.)

Simon, A. *Inventaires d'Archives (Cahiers 5).* (Louvain: Editions Nauwelaerts. 1958. Pp. 48. FB 55.–.) This brochure gives a listing of the documents, dating from 1789, to be found in the archives of the Diocese of Namur, the Chateau Gaesbeck, the Church of Ste. Gudule in Brussels, the Van Meenen and Croij families, and the Evangelical Church of Verviers.

Smith, Denis Mack. Edited by Allan Nevins and Howard M. Ehrmann. *Italy: A Modern History.* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1959. Pp. xi, 508. $7.50.)

Spencer, Robert F. *The North Alaskan Eskimo. A Study in Ecology and Society.* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1959. Pp. v, 490. $2.50.)

Sweet, Paul R. (Editor-in-chief). *Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945.* Series C *(1933-1937). The Third Reich: First Phase.* Vol. III. *June 14, 1934-March 31, 1935.* (Washington: United States Printing Office. 1959. Pp. lxxii, 1157. $4.25.)